

**On the
Situation
in the
Czechoslovak
Socialist
Republic**

II

Contents

The Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia	5
From Hitler's Aggression to Bonn's Eastern Policy	18
Mass Media, Freedom of the Press and the I.P.I.	28
The Great Conspiracy	35
I. Secret Agents Attack	35
II. The Psychological War	41
III. The "Helping" Hands	47
Inwardly Ravenous Wolves	54
The Position of the Workers in the Class Struggle between Socialism and Imperialism	62
The Intellectual Vanguard of the Counter-Revolution	76
Wehner and Brandt Lament their Defeat	94
The Anti-Socialist Economic Program of Mr. Ota Šik	99
Against Fischer at the End of an Illusion	112
The Revisionist Game of Chess with Imperialism	117
What Was Blessing Doing in Prague?	128

A "Spring Trip" – Seen in the Retrospective
Program out of the Background
True and False Unity

The Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia

Our two parties have been linked by fraternal bonds for decades. This friendship and militant community is solidly based on Marxism-Leninism, in the joint struggle for socialism and for the safeguarding of peace in Europe. In the spirit of proletarian internationalism we close militant alliance of our two parties has stood the test in many complicated and difficult situations. As the consistent revolutionary parties of our countries we jointly fought imperialist war and fascism, and the German communists and anti-fascist resistance fighters will never forget the help and support the Czech and Slovak comrades and working people gave them in the struggle against Hitler fascism.

The liberation of our peoples and countries from the yoke of fascism by the Soviet Union with which we are linked in unswerving friendship, the establishment of the workers' and farmers' rule in the GDR and in neighbouring Czechoslovakia and the transition of our states to the construction of the socialist system gave our friendship, cooperation and militant alliance a new higher quality. It became state policy. The duty to assist each other is as intrinsic to the nature of proletarian internationalism as is the way in which communists, Marxist-Leninists, as allies in struggle, frankly discuss questions which have to be tackled in the interests of our common struggle to develop socialist society and fight the enemy of the peoples, imperial-

ism. Our party proceeds from the fact that the relations between our parties are conducted on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and that problems are solved in the spirit of proletarian internationalism as is appropriate to the good traditions of our long military association.

It is a fact that during the past few months the developments in Czechoslovakia and the policy of the CPCZ have caused much concern among the members of our party and all strata of the people of the German Democratic Republic. Both the GDR and Czechoslovakia lie on the line dividing socialism from capitalism. Their geographical position puts them in the front line of the class struggle against West German imperialism and militarism. In firm alliance with the USSR, the main force of the socialist community of peoples, they have the task of decisively opposing the aggressive plans of monopoly capitalism in West Germany for changing the status quo in Europe, and causing them to fail.

In view of this situation and the sharpening of the class struggle between imperialism and socialism, the leadership of the CPCZ has not taken into consideration the significance and position of Czechoslovakia in the struggle between the two world systems in Europe. It allowed the anti-socialist, bourgeois-nationalist and rightist forces in Czechoslovakia which have obviously been organized for a long time to start an outright attack on the leading role of the CPCZ and against the socialist order.

Accounts Not Finally Settled with Capitalist Past

Characteristic in the development of Czechoslovakia since 1948 has no doubt been the fact that the working class, the peasantry and the other strata of the working people, under the leadership of the CPCZ, accomplished, in a historically short period, significant per-

formances and had big successes in the construction of socialism. Since 1948 Czechoslovakia's industrial production rose more than five-and-a-half fold; in the same period the national income trebled. A large-scale industrial and economic development completely changed the face of Slovakia. Unlike the bourgeois Czechoslovak Republic under Masaryk and Benes which was politically and economically dependent on the big capitalist powers and was at the mercy of the big imperialist powers, liberated Czechoslovakia, thanks to the efforts of its working peoples and thanks to its alliance with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, successfully went about building socialism.

Our experiences and those of the working class and their Marxist-Leninist parties in the other socialist countries teach us that only the consistent application of the generally valid laws of development of the construction of socialist society leads forward on the road to socialism. This requires that the communist parties of the socialist countries creatively work out the strategy of the development of socialist society under the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution. It is there that grave omissions and mistakes occurred in Czechoslovakia which the former leadership of the CPCZ failed to overcome.

The social and economic foundations of socialism were created with the victory of socialist relations of production in Czechoslovakia and the development of industry. The shaping of socialist society, however, requires more. The working class must be enabled to consciously manage and organize its state; the working peasantry must become the class of cooperative farmers; the leadership of party and state must closely cooperate with the working class, the cooperative farmers and the intelligentsia; outdated conceptions widespread among the intelligentsia and other sections of the people must be overcome; through a likewise consistent and patient alliance policy socialist democracy must grow under the conditions of the

workers' and farmers' power, which is a form of dictatorship of the proletariat. There were hardly any attempts in Czechoslovakia to cope with the difficult task of creating the economic system of socialism accordingly developing the state and ideological superstructure.

Due to the absence of a thorough settling of accounts with the capitalist past and the failure to explain to the people the truth about the big-bourgeois capitalist policy of Benes as had been expounded by Comrade Gottwald, misconceptions about the bourgeois state of the Czechoslovak Republic were not discarded and became elements hampering socialist development. Here is one of the essential reasons why sections of the former bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intelligentsia were oriented on the West to a degree that they subordinated their love for their socialist fatherland to those sympathies. Instead of courageously tackling the basic tasks of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism they were subject to procrastination.

Our party therefore supported the relevant decision adopted at the January and May plenums of the Central Committee of the CPCZ convinced that their gradual implementation would help to surmount the accumulated mistakes and shortcomings and, in going ahead, solve the problems of further socialist development, provided that the CPCZ progressively consolidated its leading role. Events in Czechoslovakia, however, as is known, took a different course. Instead of energetically setting about these tasks, the mass media were transferred to the petty-bourgeois forces. The heroic past of the CPCZ and the twenty years of socialist construction were drawn through the mud, past errors and weaknesses occurring were magnified and the CPCZ and socialism were even blamed for the difficulties caused by imperialism. The CPCZ was denied the moral right to the leadership of society.

Open Doors and Open Borders to Bourgeois Ideology

Citizens of the GDR cannot understand why the Czechoslovak party and state leadership permitted the mass media, in which revisionist circles had long concentrated, to place themselves outside the party and state power. In this way the mass media became centres of anti-socialist and nationalist propaganda and virtual instruments of those forces which under the guise of "correcting the mistakes of socialism" called into question the socialist order itself. Prague became a favourite destination of propagandists and hucksters of imperialism paid to soften up and undermine socialism. Officials loyal to socialism and the party were largely displaced and in many cases exposed to political and psychological pressure. After January the mass media launched an increasingly frenetic anti-Soviet campaign. Doors, gates and borders were opened to bourgeois ideology. An anti-socialist opposition, counter-revolutionary in nature and content quickly formed which more and more overtly appeared as a counter force to the Communist Party and the socialist state power.

We believed it to be also our fraternal duty to express our attitude towards the conceptions announced in Czechoslovakia as the "new model of socialism", all the more since we have met many of its elements in the writings of bourgeois and social democratic ideologists and theorists of the convergence theory. They recommend "the abolition of central state planning at a time when state monopoly capitalism is engaged in the maximum concentration of its political and economic means. They seek to orient the socialist economy of Czechoslovakia on cooperation with the capitalist monopolies, with the justification of being better able to implement the scientific and technological revolution. In reality this would lead Czechoslovakia into dependency on imperialism. In addition no imperialist state is interested in promoting the

scientific and technological progress of a socialist country. They propagated an absolute freedom of opinion, the press and assembly, which in practice turned out, as is known, to be freedom for the socialist forces and bourgeois ideologists and the lack of freedom for those disseminating socialist ideology. Under the slogan of "separating the party from power" and of political "pluralism" they demanded the mission of opposition parties, with the help of which in the final analysis the bourgeois republic of Masaryk and Benes was to be brought back. They opposed the leading role of the working class, claiming leadership for the intellectuals—for those circles which were already able to be the most eager champions of bourgeois ideology in Czechoslovakia. Unfortunately, some of these conceptions irreconcilable with Marxism-Leninism are also reflected in the CPCZ action program which was adopted at the plenary session of the Central Committee in April. Therefore in the following period, revisionist and anti-socialist forces could refer to the CPCZ action program in spreading their harmful views.

In soberly and critically rethinking about events in their country, the Czechoslovak communists and the working people of Czechoslovakia, our class brothers will understand how concerned we were to see the socialist development threatened.

Taken in by Bonn's "New Eastern Policy"

Our deep concern about the socialist future of Czechoslovakia grew all the more since the imperialists, especially the West German militarists and revisionists, had long been conspiring with anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia, and within the framework of the global strategy of US imperialism had selected Czechoslovakia as the main goal of their penetration of the community of socialist states. They considered Czechoslovakia as the weakest link in the front of the socialist

states. Now the creeping counter-revolution was to achieve what they had been unsuccessful in doing in 1948 thanks to the revolutionary action of the Czechoslovak working class led by the CPCZ. The long-term strategic plan of the West German imperialists had as its aim the "peaceful conversion" of Czechoslovakia into a social democratically trimmed bourgeois state. This imperialist conspiracy against Czechoslovakia was completely worked out and carried out in a staff-like manner.

As part of this plan West German politicians and Bundestag deputies, bank presidents and industrialists were sent to Prague disguised as journalists, to organize their centres on the spot and to support those forces bent on a policy of "opening towards the West". On the other hand, the West German monopoly capitalist press placed their columns and the radio and television services their transmissions at the disposal of Czechoslovak intellectuals such as Svitak, Goldstücker, Liehm, Kohout, Prohazka and many others. Under the cloak of the slogans of "liberalization" and "democratization" they became advisers on how to disintegrate the CPCZ and undermine the socialist order. It is no coincidence that representatives of the anti-socialist clubs and revisionist circles of Czechoslovakia appeared in the mass media of West German imperialism and washed Czechoslovak linen there. Their close political and material relations had existed for a long time. Prohazka, Sik and others had no scruples about placing themselves in the service of psychological warfare against the GDR and preaching cooperation with the monopoly capitalist West German Federal Republic.

The mass media of Czechoslovakia and statements by responsible leaders revealed with increasing clearness the underestimation or playing down of the danger emerging from the expansionist and revisionist policy of West German imperialism. The talk of the social democratic ministers about a European peace order, relaxation and understanding were ac-

cepted at face value. They were blind to the role of the social democratic ministers as accessories of the Kiesinger-Strauss government and they were taken by the "new eastern policy".

But what aims was the Kiesinger-Strauss government following with the full support of the social democratic ministers? Both before and after 21 August Kiesinger declared it was the task of the West German Federal Republic "to alter the status quo". This is precisely Strauss's objective of a European new order in which "the East European countries are severed from their present connection with the Soviet Union and brought into the sphere of interests of the Federal Republic". This very aim is pursued by the global strategy of US imperialism and its Bonn variant, "the new eastern policy".

Joint Line of March Laid Down in Karlovy Vary and Bratislava

The Czechoslovak communists will agree with us that the revolutionary party of the German working class has the most experience with the reactionary and aggressive character of German imperialism and the role of the rightwing social democratic leaders. All questions related to policy towards West Germany are directly linked with the class struggle on German soil, which is closely interlinked with the struggle for European security. Our joint line of march was announced in the declaration of the communist and workers' parties of Karlovy Vary in 1967 and the Bratislava declaration of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries. In view of the dangerous developments and with concern for the safeguarding of socialism in Czechoslovakia, the communist and workers' parties of the Soviet Union, the GDR, Poland, Hungary and Bulgaria did all they could to render all possible political assistance to the CPCZ in overcoming the ever more dangerous situa-

tion. This was served by the deliberations of Dresden, Moscow, Warsaw, Cierna and Bratislava, the consultations between the SED and the CPCZ in Karlovy Vary and the discussions between the party and state leaderships of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia in August and October in Moscow.

The declaration of Bratislava which was signed by the representatives of all fraternal parties point the way on which to develop reciprocal relations among the socialist countries on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, further to consolidate the community of socialist states and systematically and comprehensively to advance socialist society in our countries. This requires primarily that the Marxist-Leninist parties be strictly and consistently guided by the general laws of development of the construction of socialist society, that the leading role of the working class and its vanguard, the communist party, be strengthened, that the principles of Marxism-Leninism be unflinchingly adhered to, that the popular masses be educated in the spirit of the ideas of socialism and proletarian internationalism and that an implacable struggle be conducted against bourgeois ideology and all anti-socialist forces.

No effort was spared in helping the CPCZ to find a political solution to the crisis in Czechoslovakia. But the measures jointly agreed on were not consistently applied and the situation in Czechoslovakia deteriorated more and more.

Why Does the CPCZ Leadership Hide the Gravity of the Situation?

Our Czechoslovak comrades will understand that the members of our party and many citizens of our Republic asked why the CPCZ leadership did not tell the truth about the gravity of the situation. Why does it hide to the party and the people the measures

agreed on? Why does the CPCZ still fail to community of socialist states, remained open. The solidate more speedily the ideological and organizational measures of the five socialist states on 21 August, national unity of the party and the socialist consciousness, mobilize the working class and the people, order to check the anti-socialist forces and resolute take up the struggle against bourgeois ideology in the Czechoslovakia and therewith its sovereignty as a place the mass media in the hands of staunch communist state.

Should there be reason for anybody to shed tears spies of imperialist intelligence services out of the country and, in going ahead, eliminate the difficulties by relying on the fraternal alliance with the socialist states, primarily with the Soviet Union?

Today, even though sporadically, leading officials of the CPCZ answer this question by declaring that no serious efforts had been made to carry out the measures agreed upon for the protection of socialism. In fact a number of prominent party leaders had carried on a sort of double dealing, a policy of duplicity. They voiced their agreement with the jointly fixed steps and signed them, but never really intended to carry them out. This also explains why they did not publicize the agreements.

Therefore, the five socialist brother countries, hastening to the aid of the Czechoslovak peoples on 21 August this year and defending socialist Czechoslovakia against imperialism and counter-revolution acted in full harmony with the declaration of Bratislava, which had also been signed by the CPC leadership. The imperialist plans for withdrawing Czechoslovakia from the community of socialist states were thus frustrated. The western border of the community of socialist states was reliably protected against the aggressive expansionist West German NATO state pressing for expansion. The open appearance of counter-revolutionary elements was stopped, and the imperialist circles in the West were prevented from undermining Czechoslovakia. Also this attempt to alter the status quo in Europe was foiled. Thus the road towards European security which above all presupposes the consolidation of the com-

community of socialist states.

The members of our party and our working people very attentively follow what is being done in Czechoslovakia to fulfil the agreements made in Moscow on 21 August. They do not overlook the fact that the process of genuine normalization of the situation in the CSSR is progressing extremely slowly and with contradictions. One of the reasons for this is that until today there has been no clear, Marxist-Leninist assessment of developments since January of this year. Even now anti-socialist, anti-Soviet and anti-Marxist conceptions are disseminated in the press, radio and television, instead of using these media for strengthening the class positions of the workers and turning the popular masses with the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

Our Community of Struggle Calls for Joint Action

To those who reproach us with misunderstanding the psyche of the Czechoslovak peoples we reply that the national interests of the peoples of Czechoslovakia and also the interests of all socialist states require a rebuff to the imperialist plots and an open word. The time has now come for the working people, in

alliance with the cooperative farmers and social intelligentsia to show that they are better able to direct the policies of the state than those intellectuals who receive their ideas from the West and who do not believe in the strength of the working class. Vague phrases bring neither the economy nor the social development forward. For this the consistent fulfilment of the agreements of Cierna, Bratislava and Moscow is essential as is a fundamental and truthful assessment of developments in Czechoslovakia from January to August of this year. The normalization of the situation in Czechoslovakia will be all the more successful if the healthy forces within the CPCZ and the people have their say, people who, in a time of mass hysteria, petty bourgeois and nationalist confusion in the country, preserved their honour as communists and thought and acted as genuine patriots and internationalists.

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin edition, 23rd vol., No. 305 of November 3, 1968)

As Marxists-Leninists and allies of the CPCZ and the Czechoslovak working people we expect the CPCZ in carrying out the jointly worked out decision to strengthen the leading role of the working class and its party as a militant Marxist-Leninist organization and, as is said in the Bratislava declaration constantly to work to "raise the political activity of the working class, the farmers, the intelligentsia and all working strata, for all-round progress of the socialist social order, the further consolidation of socialist democracy, the perfection..... of the activity of party and state in accordance with the principle of democratic centralism".

The relations between the SED and the CPCZ, like those linking all Marxist-Leninist parties, have a principled basis. They are relations which always are and must be directed at the flourishing of socialism in our countries, the interests of the community of socialist states and the international revolutionary working-class movement. The Czechoslovak communists may rest assured that our party and the parties of the other socialist countries are ready to

help the CPCZ and the peoples of Czechoslovakia to overcome their difficulties and to develop their socialist society. Our militant alliance calls for joint action. We feel that it is necessary to have a frank discussion between our parties and their leaderships and to re-establish the traditional relations between the party organs.

Under the banner of Marxism-Leninism our two parties have gone a long and sacrificial road of struggle—jointly and in fraternal unity with the most experienced section of the international communist movement, the CPSU. This is the solid foundation on which, in future, too, the SED and the CPCZ will march along, shoulder to shoulder, on the joint road of socialism.

From Hitler's Aggression to Bonn's Eastern Policy

by Lorenz

Of all the political forces in Germany in the year 1938/39 the German communists and their anti-fascist allies in the United and Popular Front were the only ones who determinedly and without waverin opposed the plans of rapacious German imperialis which divided and subjugated Czechoslovakia. The opposition to these plans was carried out with grav risk to the lives and freedom of thousands of the be in their ranks.

These forces not only challenged the Munich conspiracy, which enabled Britain, France and Italy to sell Czechoslovakia out to Hitler Germany, but the also at the same time exposed the peace phraseolog of Chamberlain, Daladier and Mussolini both insid Germany itself and in the international arena. The showed how the dividing of Czechoslovakia was a decisive step in the march of German imperialism an militarism towards the great war, the Second World War.

The Communist Party of Germany in its official documents took a firm stand against the splitting of of the so-called Sudeten German areas from the Czechoslovak Republic, against the creation of the so-called Reich Protectorates of Bohemia and Moravia as well as against the somewhat different form of a protectorate in Slovakia.

The aim of the German finance and armament

nagates, which was strongly condemned by the communist Party of Germany, was to create a colonial area in the heart of Europe from which they could extract raw materials, industrial goods and agricultural produce to satisfy their immense greed for profits.

Today it has become a burning necessity to recall these historical truths. This is not only so because thirty years have passed since the well-prepared rapacious attack of German imperialism on the Czech and Slovakian peoples, but mainly because of German imperialism's anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary subversive activity against socialist Czechoslovakia carried on under the guise of its so-called New Eastern Policy.

It is sure that the conditions of our time, that is the world-wide transition from capitalism to socialism, are different from those of 1938/39. The powerful Soviet Union and the allied socialist countries are in a position to frustrate all imperialist attacks against the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, as events over the past few weeks have clearly demonstrated. By defending socialism they are in a position to further guarantee the national existence of the Czech and Slovak peoples, the territorial integrity and sovereignty of their state.

On German territory there exists a firm and ever more consolidating socialist state, the German Democratic Republic. Here the struggle against reactionism and against all forms of the vicious plans of German imperialism for conquest, as well as the struggle for European security and world peace, form the basis of state policy, they have become state doctrine. The G.D.R.'s foreign and home policies are to a great extent determined by those German communists and anti-fascists who were the only force in Germany in 1938/39 to wage a consistent struggle against the division of Czechoslovakia by the German imperialists. They were the only ones to stand up for the national independence and territorial integrity

of the Czechoslovak Republic. The G.D.R. is a factually untenable "Ethnic Group Law". All this, member of the socialist defence community in Europe with equal rights and obligations. The powerful force of the allied socialist countries is at the same time a firm guarantee for security in Europe and the sovereign existence of the European peoples.

Munich Policy with Changed Methods

The change of the constellation of forces in Europe nevertheless has not led to what credulous illusionists would like us to believe, namely that German imperialism has given up its plans for the conquest and domination of other countries. All that has changed and that only, partly, are the ways, means and methods with which German imperialism tries to pursue its aims. Government officials and other personalities, now carrying different names and wearing different party labels, are acting on Bonn's political scene in conformity with the spirit and aims of German imperialism. But the aims and intentions of the foreign policy of the imperialist West German state are still determined by the same old strivings of German imperialism for hegemony in Europe in order to achieve and secure maximum profits for the monopolists.

The Bonn government, including the Social Democratic ministers, is unanimous in its refusal to recognize the Munich Agreement as being null and void from the very beginning. On the contrary, it

plans in a new way. Dr Walter Becher, a confidant of Bonn's Finance Minister Franz Josef Strauss and spokesman of the Association of Sudeten German Fellow Countrymen", disclosed in the Sudetendeutsche Zeitung the new methods with which the old revanchist aims are going to be realized:

"... the best form of a credit grant and economic aid to Czechoslovakia would be to reintegrate the Sudeten German entrepreneurs and their qualified workers, to reinstate Bohemian-Silesian Germanism in their homeland which they have built up but never gained by force."

It is clear that the matter concerned here is the return of those areas which were handed over to German imperialism through the Munich conspiracy. The very same imperialist forces are again in power in the West German Federal Republic.

In their plans and intentions against Czechoslovakia the West German monopolies go even further than Becher, spokesman of the revenge-seeking groups. The contacts they had maintained for years with anti-socialist, so-called reform communists were expected to effect a political transformation in Prague which would at the same time hit directly at the socialist order in Czechoslovakia as a

With these intentions in mind the West German monopolies and finance capitalists have concerned themselves for a long time with economic infiltration intent is that it "is conscious of its obligations to protect the Sudeten German fellow countrymen like him was to disturb, limit and possibly reverse the all other expelled persons and refugees", and the country's economic cooperation and coordination Bonn will take this obligation seriously. With this in mind the other fraternal socialist countries which were Kiesinger government embraces the "right to homeland" which is incompatible with international law and which was extended by Herbert Wehner to the

countries. For this end Ota Šik and other "economic reformists" served as active accomplices in Czechoslovakia. The orientation of Czechoslovakia's economy towards the West would bring with it unemployment and a lowering of the living standards in wide sections of the Czechoslovak working class. This questionable result of these reforms is in effect till now the saddling of Czechoslovakia with foreign liabilities to the tune of 500 million dollars in the form of short term high interest credits from the West. The monopoly and finance magnates consider this an ideal way of bringing about economic dependence which at a later stage could be used as a means of political blackmail.

Thus we see the old imperialist methods of applied in a changed form. On October 15, 1939, Dr Hans Neuwirth, then deputy of the Sudeten German Party, who is today a member of the "Sudeten German Council" and also serves in the Bonn Foreign Office, wrote to Hitler's Foreign Office:

"One leaves the Czechs to themselves, pins down the remnant of the state economically, raises the rate and tempo of the resulting deterioration of social living conditions and through this encourages the strivings of the Slovaks for independence as a separate state, and then uses as a pretext the inevitable disturbances and social as well as economic difficulties to take over these historic countries by force and place them under the jurisdiction of the German Reich."

Also today economic infiltration and the creation of economic dependence obviously serves the political aims of West German imperialism although it now has to resort to other tactics, because of the existence of the socialist countries. Franz Joseph Strauss put in a nutshell when he said: The Federal Republic can no longer be an economic giant and at the same time remain a political dwarf.

Franz Josef Strauss consciously makes use of the financial and economic resources of the Bonn govern-

ment to undermine the socialist order in the east European countries, and to further his chauvinistic plan for a "Greater Europe".

One of the most important obstacles blocking the realization of West German imperialism's European plans is the existence of the German Democratic Republic. Thus it is understandable that in West German industrial and financial circles the illusionary hopes were propagated that by a triumph of the anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia also the fate of the German Democratic Republic would be sealed. In the event of such a happening West German imperialism in relation to West Berlin would use a different language towards the socialist countries and even its western allies.

This position urgently necessitated the taking of measures by the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries as a contribution towards thwarting the activities of West German imperialism against Czechoslovakia. By this the German Democratic Republic remained faithful to the legacy of all German anti-fascists, who waged a heroic struggle against German fascism and German imperialism thirty years ago and for defending the national independence of the Czechoslovak people.

Pluralism as a Method for Undermining

Socialism and the Unity of the State

The Bonn government and its propaganda machine favours in particular the introduction of the so-called pluralistic party system in socialist Czechoslovakia. The aim of this pluralist policy was to disrupt the unity of the Czechoslovak working class and the leading role of the Communist Party there. It was intended to oust the Czechoslovak Communist Party step by step from the leadership of the people, the state and the economy and to replace it by other political

parties. The Bonn ruling circles placed particular hope on the publications, *Literární Listy* and *Literární Noviny* edited by anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary writers. The editorial boards of both the publications were, according to Bonn's thinking, to carry out "communist opposition" in order to use them as a veil for safeguarding themselves against being accused of following bourgeois and revisionist policies. These methods, too, are fully in line with the proved practices of German imperialism's expansionist policy. In November 1937 Henlein submitted a memorandum to Hitler on the Sudeten German Party and wrote:

"As a party in the democratic parliamentary system of Czechoslovakia it... must use for external consumption democratic terminology and democratic parliamentary methods. At heart I cherish no wish as warmly as the integration of the whole of the Sudeten area, and even all Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia into the German Reich."

When one replaces "democratic" by words like "socialist" or "communist" and "parliamentary system" with "National Front" or "National Assembly" the one will recognize with surprise that the method which the West German revenge-seekers recommended to their agents in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic are not essentially different from those of the Hitler fascists. Kiesinger and many of his colleagues have gained and brought with them considerable experience from their service for Hitler which they now use in implementing the foreign policy of the Federal Republic.

Also belonging to such practices is the exploitation of national differences between the Czechs and the Slovaks. In 1938 a note in Hitler's Foreign Office freely made use of the expression "right of self-determination". With this expression as the catchphrase an independent Czechoslovakia was encouraged. The following quotation reveals the intention of German imperialism in relation to this matter

"Large timber resources, a part of the Czechoslovak arms industry in the Slovakian area (*Waag- and-Grantal*)... in any case a suitable prerequisite for an intensive economic interlinking with Germany, common frontiers would come into being. An independent Slovakia would be a weak state form and this would best promote the German needs to infiltrate and to get a settler's area in the East. The point of least resistance in the East."

The right to self-determination" in the service of the profit and conquest interests of German finance and monopoly capital—this reveals the downright hypocrisy of all the imperialist outcries about the right to self-determination of the people of the CSSR and of the other Socialist countries.

In connection with the much advocated pluralistic party system for the CSSR hope is placed, firstly, in the certain West German circles in the rebirth of the former People's Party in Slovakia. This Party consisting of clerical fascists played a servile role to German fascism when it was dividing Czechoslovakia. The rebirth of this party, or one of a similar nature, was seen in Bonn as a suitable instrument for action against the Communist Party of Slovakia and the socialist order. Up to this very day the West German monopolies in relation to Slovakia still cherish their profit interests.

In this manner the policy of balkanising Czechoslovakia by fascist German imperialism in changed forms with different methods and altered phraseology reveals the rebirth of revanchism.

From Benes to Snejdarek

There are still further similarities between the methods of German imperialism and its henchmen in Czechoslovakia of those times and today. One remembers that the Soviet Union was the only great European power which was prepared to defend the Czechoslovak

slovak Republic against the attacks of Fascist Germany. For external consumption the leaders of the bourgeois Czechoslovak Republic put up the pretence that they would abide by the agreements with the Soviet Union. In their dealings with the diplomats of German imperialism, however, they sang a different tune. Hitler's envoy, Eisenlohr, was able to report to the Reich Foreign Office on February 16, 1938 on the talks he had with the then President Benes in the manner:

"He (Benes) is working out a way by which he could gradually come close to us (Fascist Germany) to clear the atmosphere until one day when good relations could even be publicly manifested... His pact with Russia is nothing but a remnant from an expiring epoch; he could not however just throw it in the waste paper basket. It is obvious that Professor Snejdarek, the Director of the Institute for International Relations in Prague was acting in the same way when he declared in talks with West German politicians that the C.S.S.R. was ready to give up all its preconditions about establishing diplomatic relations with Bonn if the Federal Republic were to take an acceptable attitude towards the Munich Treaty. Though publicly declaring loyalty to the Warsaw Pact the demands of the Warsaw Pact members were plainly abandoned in internal talks to the Bonn government.

Prof. Snejdarek, and we do not know from whom he received his mandate, complied with the wishes of Bonn Foreign Minister Brandt who had declared before the Austrian Society for Foreign Affairs, that he could not understand why the members of the Warsaw Pact take a specific stand against the Federal Republic, thus foregoing the opportunity to bring about improved relations with the Federal Republic

Conclusions

From all the known facts and events of the past and present in Czechoslovakia result a number of inevitable conclusions with convincing clarity.

1. The measures of the fraternal socialist countries who responded to the call of the conscious Czechoslovak party and state functionaries were necessary, correct and timely.

2. They have wrecked all the economic and political plans of Bonn's "Eastern Policy". West German imperialism and its revenge-seeking bands are the ones hit most severely by what happened in Czechoslovakia after August 21.

3. Protection and safeguard of socialist development are at the same time protection and safeguard of the national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

4. The measures for protecting socialist development in Czechoslovakia are an effective contribution to guaranteeing and securing peace in Europe, and are indeed an effective service in the interest of world peace.

(From Neues Deutschland, Berlin, September 1, 1968)

Mass Media, Freedom of the Press and the I.P.I.

by Prof. Dr Franz Knipping

In the loud-mouthed propaganda chorus of international reaction against the move of the five fraternal socialist countries there was a voice from Zurich which joined them. It belongs to an obscure enterprise which calls itself International Press Institute. The Director of the I.P.I., Per Monsen, linked his protest with the statement that the journalists in the C.S.S.R. had attained an "honourable place in the annals of world journalism". They therefore deserved the respect of their colleagues in the Western world.

The Mission of the Zurich Institute

The motives and background to these utterings become clear when one remembers the special role of the I.P.I. in the psychological warfare of imperialism. It was founded in 1951, during the time of the Cold War. Among those who give money to it are billionaires like Ford and Rockefeller and the leading newspaper magnates in the U.S.A. In recent years they have also been joined by some major West German press trusts.

At first the activities of the I.P.I. remained mainly limited to Europe. As time went on, this Institute dedicated itself to the infiltration of Asia and Africa. It was given instructions to obstruct the building of

in independent national press system in the developing countries, wherever possible. Though these efforts showed some success, the promoters and financiers expressed dissatisfaction. The U.S.A. delegate Lester Markel emphasized during last year's I.P.I. general meeting that it was as important to tackle the problems of the developed world at once. From the concept of the global strategists, no longer ready to meet socialism in a frontal attack, but to scrape it out from within—this brought about new tasks for the I.P.I. The Institute was expected to find out weak spots in the mass media of socialist countries and to establish contacts with suitable journalists and press men in these countries.

Ford as a Generous Contributor

"Money must be mobilized for all this," so demanded Monsen and "only up to now there has been nothing to stimulate work." The I.P.I. had hardly approved of the new directive when money started flowing in. The I.P.I. information bulletin exalted "immediately after the general meeting news which gladdened the heart reached the Institute, that the Ford Foundation has granted a new allowance of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars."

This financial injection enabled the Institute to organize a seminar in Geneva in March 1968 for a group of press men from 21 countries. In contrast to the usual practice there were for the first time among those taking part some journalist from socialist countries. One of them demonstrated his gratitude to the organizers in a very striking way. He assured them that the meeting had given a new impetus to his journalistic work, and how very valuable for him the political and professional discussions of the seminar had been, including the whole exchange of views. This journalist, described as a "leftist" of the seminar is named Emil Sip. He was the editor of a leading

newspaper in Prague responsible for questions foreign policy.

The Confession of Emil Sip

Hardly had he returned to Prague when Emil Sip gave I.P.I. a detailed account of the press relations in his country. The information bulletin of the I.P.I. gave him report the title "a valuable historical document". The Institute expressed the wish that he would receive the acclaim he deserved—this was how it was termed the issue mentioned above: "The example set by the Czechoslovak press in the struggle for freedom could and should be infectious".

The contribution already referred to could be given the title "A Guide to the Organisation of Counter-Revolution through the Mass Media"—it incorporated a blue print for the effective operation of the press, radio and television in a socialist country in forming public opinion. With this the author unwittingly confirms the fundamental thesis that the mass media are at anytime and in every society, instruments for wielding power. Under socialist conditions, the mass media are an integral component of the power of the working people. Those who work in this field are therefore in a highly responsible position. Careless manipulation of these means of disseminating information, a misuse of the achievements of ideological mass communication for selfish purposes, contrary to the interests of socialist society therefore inevitably undermines the popular power. This was precisely the case in the C.S.S.R.

Opinion Monopoly of a Handful of Intellectuals

Sip mentions two basic conditions which were present in the Czechoslovak mass media after the January Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the

Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. It was possible for the journalists "to shake off both the controlling guidance of the leadership from above and the retaliative censorship from below." In other words: the influence of the leading political and social force, the revolutionary party of the working class, on the mass media was broken. At the same time, the press, radio and television were no longer subject to the social control of the working people. Freedom of the press and of opinion, which, in a socialist country, are inalienable rights, linked to the interests of the whole community, became the prerogative of a small group of intellectuals. They not only departed from the party but at the same time they fancied themselves to be superior to the people. In this way they were able to exploit the unique position of power which came into their hands, that is, power over the thoughts, feelings and actions of millions of people; at the end, this became a serious threat to the existence of socialist society.

The report of Emil Sip on the "political metamorphosis of the Czechoslovak press" clearly illustrates each stage of this process. Following his description of the situation, it can be seen that the anti-socialist escalation of the mass media went as follows:

Firstly: In order to undermine the leading role of the party in the field of guiding public opinion, the mass media needed at first the support of the party and its leading organs. A controlling influence over the majority of the most important publications came into the hands of the right-wing group which began to increase its activity after the January plenary session. These "militant elements" of the "revisionist wing"—in which Sip includes among others the economist Šik and the Pro Rector of the Charles University Goldstücker—gave the press "unconditional protection". At the same time, the radio and television, which in any case have a wider sphere of influence, played an important part, and naturally backed the press.

Working up the Readers into a State of Frenzy

Secondly: The transformation of the mass media into a mouthpiece for the expression of right-wing opinion ensured that maximum publicity was given to the activities of these forces: "Overnight, whole pages of the press and a large part of broadcasting time were given over to the representatives of the 'progressive' (or rather revisionist) wing of the Party; the people were suddenly inundated with requests for articles, interviews, appearances on television etc. It resulted in a literal competition between the mass media, to give the most detailed and up to date reports on the activities of the 'progressives'. On the other side of the coin: the columns of the press and the microphones were denied to the health care of the Party, the Marxist-Leninist forces. Only in exceptional cases could they still put their views before the public effectively.

Thirdly: Having at their disposal the mass media made it possible for the right-wing to conduct debate of an unprincipled and boundless retrogressive nature. This was done in such a manner "that the readers went into a frenzy which in turn paved the way for even greater pressure to be used toward the acceleration of the democratisation process." The impression that the twenty years of successful social development was but a succession of mistakes, was given to the recipients of the mass media. The establishment of the socialist state was represented as being the greatest mistake of all.

Fourthly: Making use of the pressure of public opinion which they themselves had systematically fermented and built up, those in control of the mass media began to further consolidate their position. The situation was described as follows: Some of the best-known newspapers took advantage of the circumstances to conduct "purges" and organized their own regeneration process." As a result, experienced journalists who were loyal supporters of the party

and of socialism were thrown out of work — a process which began in the trade union newspaper *Práce* and which soon spread to all the newspapers of Prague. Fifthly: Having "purged" the loyal party members from among their ranks, the various organs of the press let loose a campaign against the officers of the party and the mass organisations. This went so far that actual lists of names to be ousted were published. Thus, for instance, the editorial board of the trade union paper *Práce* organised a political discussion and campaign directed against the leadership—even though this was against the will of the trade union leaders. As a result all the "top people" had to resign unhonoured and unsung. This procedure was paralleled by other newspapers including the youth paper "*Mladá Fronta*".

Organizers of the Counter Revolution

Sixthly: Under the aspects of the "absolute freedom of the press and of opinion" being interpreted in this manner the Lenin theses confirmed themselves again: that the Press forms the centre and basis of political organisation. Under the prevailing conditions obviously with a clearly negative anti-socialist accent. The organizing function of the press expressed itself, for example, in the case of the "*Mladá Fronta*"; in the "rapid reorientation of the Czechoslovakian youth organisations". It resulted in the "preparation of an independent student's organisation", in the "founding of a Boy Scouts Movement" etc. Henceforth other mass media were not only able to "criticise the leading political personalities, from Premier to President, but even to organise protest meetings against the 'establishment' on their own part."

It now became clear that the situation which had developed was according to the plans of the imperialist strategists. One could read it in the *Ham-burger Spiegel* of August 28: freedom of opinion for

anti-socialist forces as a "preliminary stage toward freedom to establish political organisations". And this again as "the preliminary stage towards installing a pluralistic, i.e. a Western style parliamentary state". Which in plain English means nothing else but the restoration of the bourgeois state.

Seventhy: The I.P.I. informer, Sip, remarked "was especially interesting to see how quickly and thoroughly the Czechoslovak press evolved in the direction of the democratic newspapers of the West. This obviously by no means refers to the few Communist and other progressive publications in the capitalist countries. The monopoly press was made the ideal worth striving for and this was done with unwavering consistency. The imitation of western press practices increased in many places to an organized cooperation between the anti-socialist forces inside and outside the country. The columns of the Czechoslovak press were opened to professional anti-communists like the staff of the imperialist agents' centre, Radio Free Europe and others. At the same time, the more anti-socialist and provocative press agencies and politicians became, the wider was the field imperialist radio and television stations offered to them.

Today not the slightest doubt remains that the mass media in the C.S.S.R. by their organizing and scheming have brought about the dangerous situation which made inevitable the action of the five fraternal countries in order to protect socialism. Now, since the aim is to normalize the situation in the C.S.S.R. as soon as possible it is imperative that "effective steps in the interests of socialist power" particularly in the field of mass communication and its influence on forming public opinion, be taken. The implementation of the decisions of Cierna and the principles of Bratislava make it a matter of urgent necessity to secure the political leadership of the press, radio and television in the spirit of socialism. (From *Neues Deutschland* Berlin, September 3, 1968)

The Great Conspiracy

Harri Czepuck

Secret Agents Attack

The hands of the clock, synchronized by the imperialist global strategists in Bonn, Munich, Washington, Vienna and Prague, appeared to be moving inexorably towards zero hour in the C.S.S.R. Unofficially, they had allowed themselves about a week. The leaders of the counter-revolution, from Svitek to Šilk, were already outside the country for consultations. Inside the country, the way was open. Everything was in readiness.

The hour had struck. It was the night of the 1st August, 1968. The allied armies hastened to the assistance of the loyal socialist, patriotic and internationalist elements in the C.S.S.R.

Friends and enemies alike realized at that moment that the status quo in Europe was not going to be upset. The balance of power was not going to be altered in favour of imperialism. The global strategy of imperialism received a rude, and for some, incomprehensible, setback.

The proponents of the global strategy took the lesson to heart. But not so much those between the Atlantic Coast and the Black Sea who really believed that the events in the C.S.S.R. were purely an internal affair, that merely an attempt was being made to

correct the mistakes of the past so as to bring socialism in a better way.

These people were only victims of a manipulative strategy which was intended to serve as a cover one of the biggest imperialist attacks on social positions launched during the past twelve years.

Where it all Began

First let us give an account of what we know already about it. These facts alone will enable us to form an idea of this great conspiracy.

Immediately after the Second World War the imperialists attempted to regain the political, economic and strategic positions they had lost as a result of the changes that had rocked the world. The leading capitalist country, the U.S.A. started what was to become known in history as the "cold war". By every available means, socialism in Europe was to be "rolled back" and any efforts towards national and social liberation in the rest of the world were to be halted.

During this period (1947) the C.I.A. (Central Intelligence Agency) was inaugurated, built on the foundation of the O.S.S. (Office of Strategic Service) which had come into being during World War II.

The Chief of the O.S.S., General Donovan, had developed the theory that, if an enemy could not be overrun in the early stages by military force, a campaign of psychological warfare had to be undertaken in order to wear him down. This would facilitate the eventual military defeat.

After a period of transition the directorship of the C.I.A. was taken up by Allen Dulles, the brother of the then American Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. From this time on, the C.I.A. became an essential instrument of American foreign policy. What are not going to talk here about the coups d'état, civil wars, changes of governments for which the C.I.A. has been responsible. One could start with Guatemala in 1954 and end with the military coup in

Greece, without by any means having told the whole story.

The Old Man and the Address Book

Let us now for a while limit ourselves to the case of Czechoslovakia. The C.I.A. with its headquarters in the Washington township of Foggy Bottom, had been busy on its subversive activities against this country since 1948. It has almost 30,000 officers at its disposal, and, since 1951, has been spending 100 million dollars annually on its work in socialist countries alone.

The Munich publishers, Isarverlag, brought out a book by Joachim Joesten in 1958 which was called *CIA—Wie der amerikanische Geheimdienst arbeitet* (CIA, or how the American Secret Service Works). On page 31 of this book one finds the following interesting passage. "In a large bright office somewhere in Washington sits a well-groomed, Slav-looking gentleman. On his desk there is a pile of large books made of cheap paper and having broad cardboard backs. Dozens of volumes of a similar kind are standing on the shelves which line two walls of the room.

"The man is slowly turning over the pages of a volume which lies open in front of him. It is the address book of the city of Prague, issued in 1957. Carefully he ticks every name, row after row, checking every line. On every second or third page the searching finger stops. Now the old man turns to the 1956 issue of the same address book to compare two names and addresses. Now and then this 'name checker' stands up and goes to a big map of Prague which covers the third wall of his office. From a small box he takes a handful of pin-size flags of different colours. Now he pins a red one on No. 121 St. Wenceslas Square, then a blue one on a small alley in Josefov. Amidst the host of red and blue flags a green one is seen here and there.

"The old man was once a Professor at the University of Prague. He had taught Russian and History for many years before he entered the service of C.I.A. His present job is to assess the political and social changes in Prague as they occur year by year from his methodical study of the address books."

In this book Joesten recalls the case of a journalist one William Oatis, who was arrested for espionage in Czechoslovakia in 1951, and who was later released:

"It could be said almost with certainty that Oatis was no spy in the normal sense. But it is not possible that some of the material he collected instead of going to the Associated Press went, instead, to circles associated with the C.I.A."

In this, we have an interesting example of the way the C.I.A. operates, which also throws light on present-day events in the C.S.S.R.

In Search of Agents

A usually well-informed newspaper, the *Wall Street Journal*, made a very interesting confession in an issue of 24 February, 1967:

"There is no shortage of examples to illustrate the cooperation which exists between the C.I.A. and the news media. Erwin D. Canham, editor-in-chief of the *Christian Science Monitor* gave out the information that editors of his newspaper do, now and then, exchange information about development in foreign countries with members of the C.I.A."

"Other links between press representatives and the C.I.A. do exist. It is known, for example, that the C.I.A. approached some newspapers with the request that one of their agents should be employed on the staff as a foreign correspondent. The C.I.A. gave an assurance that the man in question was a competent journalist and that he would be in a position to fulfil his professional obligations satisfactorily." (translated from German—ed.)

Co-incidence or not?

To take a momentary jump into the present day: who could ever forget the flood of Western journalists which has been pouring into Czechoslovakia since last January, and even, to some extent, before then?

Let us take a few examples in which it is possible to indicate some strikingly similar patterns of movement. There is Herr Metitzky from the Second West German Television Station. The foreign registration number of the car in which he travels through Prague is changed daily. He arrived in Czechoslovakia in good time when the counter-revolution was still in its early stages. He arrived in Budapest in 1956, a few days before the counter-revolutionary coup, where he sat and awaited developments. Was this a coincidence?

There are the reporters of the Vienna yellow press, which is owned by the Austrian counterpart of Springer, Herr Molden. Molden publishes, as has already been said, books and programmes of the counter-revolutionary forces of the C.S.S.R. to whom he also gives substantial financial support. Among the authors they publish are: Antonin Liehm, editor-in-chief of *Literarny Listy*; Ota Šik, the prime mover of the anti-socialist economic programme; Ludwig Vauculik, the author of the "2,000 Words" and Eduard Goldstücker, one of the ideologists behind the counter-revolutionary movement in the C.S.S.R.

What has all this got to do with the C.I.A.? Simply this: Herr Molden is the son-in-law of Allen Dulles.

Or to take another example: at the peak of the period of counter-revolutionary activity in the C.S.S.R., Herr Heinz Schewe appeared in Prague as a correspondent for Springer's daily *Die Welt*. In his ordinary capacity he is the paper's correspondent in Tel Aviv. Herr Schewe, who was the correspondent of *Die Welt* in Moscow from 1957 to May 1967, was sent to Tel Aviv exactly ten days before the Israeli aggression.

Now he is in Prague at a very timely moment. Is this co-incidence?

One perhaps does not only have to point to Springer's close connections with the various secret service organizations and government departments in order to cast doubts on the "co-incidental" nature of these matters. One can also point out personal and private connections, as in the case of Molden. Springer's fourth wife is the daughter of Sarre, the big business magnate. She is also the niece of General Schulze of Gaevernitz, a close friend of Allen Dulles, whom he assisted in Switzerland in his talks with S.S. General Wolff, shortly before the end of the war.

But let us return to the long-term planning method of the C.I.A. There is yet another method which has also had obvious effectiveness in the C.S.S.R. In the previously quoted *Wall Street Journal* one finds the following:

"The web of connections between the C.I.A. and private businesses stretches upwards to include commercial enterprise—particularly the giant concerns whose activities are world-wide."

The newspaper then lists a number of universally known companies. Let us take only one example: "The Kaiser Jeep Corp., a subsidiary company of the Kaiser Industries Corp., stated that the C.I.A. came to them and asked them to prepare a report on an advertising survey which had taken 25 managers and staff members of the company to several East European countries, including Poland, Czechoslovakia and Rumania. A representative of the Kaiser firm declared: 'We were of the opinion that we should work with them.'"

1,500 C.I.A. Agents

Who bothers to count the number of business representatives or investigate their "business" in the Prague Hotels "Alacron", "Esplanade" or "Jalta"?

In the meantime, however, it is known that 30 Cze-

choslovak emigrants serving in the U.S. Army who were dressed in plain clothes crossed the Czechoslovak border from Austria. In Bad Tölz members of the 10th Special Forces Group assembled with the objective of crossing over into Czechoslovakia. The Schwarzenberg barracks near Salzburg, the Fighting Forces School No.1 in Hammelburg, Bavaria, the Airborne Troops and Transport School in Schongau all served as rallying points for such "specialists".

One thing is clear; according to a report by the American writer Art Shields—at the beginning of August, 1,500 C.I.A. agents were on Czechoslovak territory.

The secret service agencies are only a political instrument whose conception was designed by others. Their creators are the monopolists, who have strong economic interests, and the politicians representing these interests.

II. The Psychological War

The secret services, above all the C.I.A., did not only record results. They laid the basis for heavy defeats of imperialism whenever they incorrectly assessed the constellation of forces. Without departing from their entire strategy, which also determines the work of the secret services, the imperialists drew a number of conclusions from this, which necessitated variation of the tactics employed.

With Johnson's policy of "bridge-building" the struggle against the socialist countries shifted more and more, if not to say absolutely, to the field of psychological warfare and ideological struggle.

In Europe a main ally offered its services to this end: the West German Federal Republic. It was, without any shadow of a doubt, created to be used as a battering-ram against the socialist development in Europe. During Adenauer's chancellorship it played the role assigned to it, a role which was increasingly

in harmony with its own big-power interests that we ever more clearly coming to the fore. It continues to play this role because its ambitions to win hegemony in Europe have grown. But through its clear defeat on August 13, 1961, it became obvious that a direct frontal attack is now no longer possible.

So together with Kennedy's "peace strategy" (which began at the same time as the open aggression in Vietnam) and Johnson's "bridge building" policy (propagated at the same time as the escalation in Vietnam, the aggression in the Middle East and the military putsch in Greece) West Germany's "new eastern policy" came into being. It is as we have already shown a smokescreen concealing an aggressive and expansionist policy.

Thus all the theories which we now hear about the "new eastern policy" is not at all new.

The Recipe

In February 1962, no less than Theodor Oberländer then a Minister in the Bonn Government with his experience in subversive activities set out the aims of psychological warfare as follows, in the military journal *Der Stahlhelm* (2/62):

"It is war without a visible beginning. It is declared like a military war, nor does it begin with the marching-in of troops; it starts invisibly through journalism, infiltration and the sending-in of spies. In fact, it is all the more successful the lesser it attracts attention, the lesser it arouses defence forces. This revolutionary war must be waged thoroughly on the borders of democracy... to wage it thoroughly does not only mean to bring the people into action but also to direct the whole state system, the general political line of the government and the platform of the parties along these lines."

On reading this we are automatically drawn to the developments which we had witnessed for months in Czechoslovakia up to August 21. Here we have the

recipe which the counter-revolutionary forces at home and abroad employ: the war began "almost invisibly through journalism".

When in January the weekly *Literární Listy* was published by a circle of open counter-revolutionaries around Antonín Liehm the silent war against socialism in the Č.S.S.R. began to manifest itself.

The number 0 edition included a lesson in social democracy entitled "The tradition which we want to develop" by Professor Goldstücker as well as a contribution by a historian named Fischer who wrote on the importance of Thomas Masaryk to Czech history.

Following this a Masaryk cult came into being throughout Czechoslovakia. His picture appeared in the shops and postcards carrying his portrait were sold by the millions. Thus Masaryk was put forward as the alternative to socialism. He was the man who from his bourgeois position set out to bring independence for Czechoslovakia fifty years ago but at the same time bargained it with Paris and London. He was the man who created the domination of the big bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia and whose policy ultimately led to 1938.

Not a word is said about the fact that in those times one Czech worker in every eight was unemployed, that Slovakia was an underdeveloped country and that in the north Bohemian coal districts there were hunger uprisings. Not a word. Yet Masaryk was made into an idol and the whole press which had been visibly engaged in psychological warfare since January, suddenly measured socialism in accordance with Masaryk's policy.

Obviously: One factor favoured these forces and they knew how to use it to their advantage. For years the Czechoslovak Communist Party had neglected the ideological field. It had not prepared or equipped the party membership and the whole population for ideological struggle. So the opponents found a ready-made vacuum and filled it. The example of Masaryk is only one of many.

Social Democracy

In the "invisible" journalistic war, which, in fact became ever more visible, the concept of "democratic socialism" played an ever growing role. It is not to nothing that the West German Social Democratic leaders joined in this concept of "democratic socialism" although in their own country, the Federal Republic, they threw both socialism and democracy overboard.

What they did in a refined way was to set this process in motion through their spiritual infiltration Professor Klaus Mehnert, the Kremlin astrologist clearly assessed this in West German television on March 30 when he said:

"This means developments in a direction which would have gravely irritated Lenin, namely toward: social democracy, democratic socialism in Czechoslovakia... It would therefore be logical if, even there, social democracy took over the reins one day."

What this means is clear, when one knows how the right-wing social democrats deal with the working class in the ideological field and that they are aiding the bourgeoisie.

Without Communists

An article appeared in *Literární Listy* in which its author, Václav Havel, rejected the leading role of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (other press organs also came strongly out in support of this concept) and promoted the possibility of a "legal opposition" because he deemed necessary the "formation of political will outside the Communist Party".

Here the aim is openly worked out: Forming a "Social Democratic opposition" to the Communist Party under the motto: first share power with the communists and then exclude them altogether.

On June 27, 1968, the editorial in the *Münchener Merkur* noted with satisfaction:

"If a thing like this happened not only in Czechoslovakia but in the whole Eastern bloc, it could mean the end of communism".

The infiltration was systematically pursued.

What had been demanded for years by the so-called *Landmannschaften* (revanchist refugee organizations) in West Germany as well as by the Bonn Government suddenly became the slogan of the "reformers", the so-called progressive forces.

The elections to the shop committees which were carried out six months ago saw a campaign by the counter-revolutionaries under the slogan of: "Shop committees without communists!". Unfortunately this slogan was in part not without success. But where does it come from?

On July 1, 1963, the Social Democrat Wenzel Jaksch, leader of the revenge-seekers' organizations, sent a note of greetings to the so-called Sudeten Congress in Stuttgart, including the following passage:

"A communist domination of lasting nature in Bohemia will spell the downfall of the Czech people. It could continue existing as a language community, but its very soul would have been bolshevized. That is why we say to all those who talk about Europe: A peaceful Europe must also include a German Sudetenland".

Even more openly Hans-Christoph Seebohm, then a minister in the Bonn government and spokesman of the *Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft*, had told a press conference in Cologne in the summer of 1961: "We will return to our hereditary home. But it will be one without Czechs and Communists."

A home country without Communists, trade unions without Communists, a government without Communists, Czechoslovakia without Communists,—they would have reached the goal of their imperialist ambitions.

Far-reaching aims

In the mouthpiece of the West German CDU, *Politisch-Soziale Korrespondenz* Ernst Majonica, chairman of the foreign policy commission of the CDU/CSU parliamentary group, wrote as follows:

"In foreign policy we have far-reaching aims. Reunification means a radical change of the relations of power that have developed after World War II."

These far-reaching aims which presuppose a changing of the relations of power—, mean: The West German imperialist know that in order to realize their plans they must change the status quo. Only a few days before the solidarity action of the allied socialist countries, Federal Chancellor Kiesinger, in an exstasy of imminent success, was careless enough to utter this loudly. With this, West Germany's protestations that it "did not interfere" were reduced to absurdity.

For the Federal Republic hegemony is at stake. Franz Josef Strauss formulated these in his book *Entwurf für Europa* (Design for Europe):

"We should recall that Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania etc. belong to Europe as much as Switzerland, Holland or Belgium do. By exerting influence on these countries it must be ensured in a lengthy process, that these countries become a component part of Europe, for a start at least in the sense of an 'intermediate Europe'..."

The next aim is European federation. It will gradually be given sovereign national rights. The present nation-states would receive in the course of time a status similar to that of the *Länder* in the German federal state."

Here we have, as we see, an Europe without communists which is synonymous to a Greater Germany. Behind this we find not only the power policy of West German imperialism, but also economic interests.

Flick who is prospecting for Uranium in the Bavarian Forest, naturally wants to be in possession of the uranium mines on the other side of the border, in

Czechoslovakia. That same Flick has pinned his hopes also on the Czechoslovak automobile industry, which would then make him the greatest automobile producer in Europe (he would control then Daimler-Benz, Auto-Union, part of the Volkswagenwerke, part of BMW, Škoda, Tatra).

The AEG group has turned its mind to the old production centres of Děčín and Podmokly which it had exploited during the Second World War.

The IG-Farben group is eager to regain control over the north Bohemian chemical industry.

In order to raise these claims and to support them financially the monopolies have established several dummy organisations with which they financed the revenge-seeking groups and counter-revolutionary forces in the Č.S.S.R.

One of those organisations is the "Representative Society of Economic Enterprises Expelled from their Homeland" in Bonn, at No. 15 Poppelsdorfer Allee, an earlier Sudeten German entrepreneur, Max Richter, whose domicile is now in Marburg a. d. Lahn. A second organisation is the "South East European Society" (SOG). In its board of directors we find representatives of the IG-Farben group, the Deutsche Bank, the Dresdener Bank, the Commerzbank, the Bayerische-Hypotheken- und Wechselbank and the Wandt group.

This organisation, for example, grants financial support to the Deutsche Welle radio station, which is directly instructed and directed the counter-revolutionaries, during the recent events in the Č.S.S.R.

III. The "Helping" Hands

The "Yalta" Hotel on Prague's Wenceslas Square often had illustrious guests. The most interesting long-term guests whom it has accommodated for something like a year are the members of the West German trade mission led by Dr Heipertz. If there is

to be trade between two countries, then there must be centres responsible for making transactions. This is clear. In the meantime things were happening in the suite on the second floor of the "Yalta" Hotel which from the very beginning, but to an increasing extent since January, had little to do with trade in the classical sense of the world.

The cars parked in front of the hotel and the large number of guests allowed all sorts of conclusions to be drawn. The role that the strange mission of Dr Heipertz was playing became obvious, to be sure, on August 24, 1945, when West German broadcasting, linked up with the "free radios" of Czechoslovakia which were operated by anti-socialist forces, transmitted a so-called report on the situation by a Frau Dr Müller of the true mission, which contained open counter-revolutionary instructions.

At that moment it became apparent what had been carried out under cover for months.

For a long time Heipertz had kept in close contact with the Czechoslovak economist Selucky who, for his part, was an intimate friend of Ota Šik. Thus not only the so-called economic reform programme of Mr. Selucky was "fructified" by Heipertz and embellished with West German promises of credits, but Heipertz was also acquainted with the most confidential affairs of the government.

Prominent Visitors

This induced Heipertz not only to make the usual reports to his superiors in Bonn, but also to propose that experts and politicians be sent to Prague, to whom he wanted to establish the necessary contact with the "appropriate quarters".

The most prominent and influential visitor was the President of the West German Federal Bank, Kaas-Blessing, at the beginning of July. This man, who at one time was among Himmler's circle of friends, formerly was commissioner-general of the German

branch of Unilever. But prior to the Second World War the Unilever trust had a considerable holding in Czechoslovak industrial undertakings. Unilever people from Great Britain were among the foreign policy advisers of the first Head of State of Czechoslovakia, President Masaryk, around whom an unprecedented cult was established during the time of preparing for the counter-revolution.

One can see, therefore, that Herr Blessing is an interesting man who was certainly eager to take up old contacts and who at the same time, however, was authorized to present the head of the Czechoslovak Federal Bank with offers of credits under the appropriate conditions.

A second interesting visit was that of a delegation of Members of Parliament of the coalition government in Bonn. These MPs were Eppler (Social Democrat), Müller-Herrmann and Marx (CDU party). Here the suggestive fact should not be forgotten that one member of this delegation, namely Herr Werner Marx, had only a short time before stayed in Greece, which is ruled by a fascist military junta, where he felt that the dictatorship was not so bad after all and that democracy was being quite respectably attended to.

These experts, then, stayed for several days in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic where they established contacts both with official bodies and, in particular, with journalists of *Literární Listy*, *Svobodné slovo* and *Práce*. The upkeep of a close "exchange of experience" was dealt with and a delegation of journalists from Czechoslovakia were invited to visit the Federal Republic.

What would happen if ...?

In the meantime Heipertz independently took up contacts with radio and television journalists. There were several meetings with the head of Prague television, Jiří Pelikan, who was one of the leading brains

of the anti-socialist forces. In doing so measures were quite openly discussed for case X—what would happen if the counter-revolution was forced, no matter for what reason, to work illegally for a length of time. Heipertz promised help and the now well-known supply of transportable radio and television equipment units was made by AEG and Lorenz. Indeed, the broadcasting equipment was used for a time after 21st August, and in some cases on wavelengths which also could be switched over to by the *Deutsche Welle*, the *Deutschlandfunk* and *Radio Free Europe*, so that it was often not clear who was really broadcasting and from where this was being done.

Radio Free Europe, which played an insidious role in 1956 against Hungary, increased its direct transmissions in the Czech and Slovak languages—quite apart from the taking over of the "free broadcasting stations"—to 22 hours per day. More than 120 Czech and Slovak emigrés, mostly Tiso people (Josef Tiso was the head of the Slovak government that was dependent on Hitler from 1939 to 1944) worked the English Garden No. 1 in Munich in order to bring up the counter-revolution.

The Bundeswehr (West German armed forces) moved its psychological warfare (PSK) battalions from Andernach, Ulm and Hammelburg up to the vicinity of the border and gave its support to the concentrated broadcasting campaign, as the western press has also had to admit in the meantime. At times there were so many "free broadcasting stations" on the frequencies that they had to tell each other to get the air so that they could get a word in.

Apart from the station *Radio Free Europe*, a centre of subversion maintained in West Germany by the U.S.A., the official West German government broadcasting stations *Deutschlandfunk* and the *Deutsche Welle* were the main ones which tried to direct influence events in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic by expanded programmes in the Czech and Slovak languages.

Just the Same as in Hungary

But most of the threads converged on the "Yalta" hotel where Heipertz was able to receive yet another prominent guest in the middle of July, who was undertaking a "private lecture tour": Walter Scheel, Chairman of the West German FDP party and former Minister for "development aid" in the Bonn Government. His trip by a leading FDP politician is reminiscent of the journey made by FDP Member of Parliament Hubertus Prinz von Löwenstein to Budapest in October 1956, who also helped to substantially influence the events from his hotel. The development aid which Scheel brought the counter-revolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia in 1968 consisted of lectures on the allegedly non-existent danger of West German fascism and revanchism, on "liberal policy", as well as the attempt to slander the GDR and to assert the necessity of its isolation.

Over the few days which followed, one could read and hear a great deal about this in the press, radio and television. "Freedom of the press" prevailed. However, it served, as Lenin formulated as long ago as 1921, not the working class, but the bourgeoisie. "We clearly see this fact," Lenin wrote at that time to G. Myasnikow, that "freedom of the press" means in practice that the international bourgeoisie will immediately buy up hundreds and thousands of Cadet, Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik writers, and will organize their propaganda and fight against us."

Suspicious Loans

But not only in the above-mentioned fields was there extensive agreement between West German politicians and the anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary forces. Even the *Landsmannschaften*, the most evil revanchist gangs, were welcomed for their intellectual and political aid. In July two Czechoslovak politicians surprised West German television viewers by remark-

ing that they could well imagine that Sudeten Germans would once again be able to return to Czechoslovakia. Where on earth did they get that?

On 2nd July 1968 the chief of the Sudeten German Becher, who was editor-in-chief of the Nazi newspaper *Landsmannschaft*, CSU Bundestag deputy Walter Die Zeit in the Sudeten region of that time and Konrad Henlein, stated at a revanchist rally in Stuttgart that:

"I know that it will sound audacious to many. Yet many Czechs and Slovaks agree with us when I say that the best form of economic aid for Czechoslovakia would be the reintegration of Sudeten German entrepreneurs and skilled workers, would be the reincorporation of Bohemian-Moravian Germanism in its old homeland."

The German-language *Volkszeitung* in Prague began at the same time to print readers' letters sent to the Sudeten German *Landsmannschaft*.

The "helping" hands were no longer to be overseen

The Waiters ...

Within the framework of this report it has not been possible to deal with the role played by the so-called clubs, which had come into existence under the management of anti-socialist forces, and in some cases fascist ones. They comprised one of the centres of the internal counter-revolution. As the *Spiegel* had recently admitted, it had been envisaged to bring out a newspaper in autumn which would be edited by former personnel of the Czechoslovakian Legion, who had taken part 50 years ago in the armed intervention against the young Soviet state.

Neither could the role of the clergy be dealt with which, as in Hungary in 1956, likewise fulfilled its "responsibilities". Archbishop Beran, who was at one time expelled from the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, had been waiting in West Germany since the be-

ginning of August after having left the Vatican. What for?

What were they all waiting for—in Munich and Bonn, in Cologne and West Berlin, in Washington and Vienna? They were waiting for the grand plot to succeed with which they once again threatened peace in Europe. They were waiting for the attack to start which they had defensively introduced against a socialist country, and to be carried off successfully. And they needed this success very badly after the many defeats of the past few years. This time they also did not hit it off.

... Were Disappointed

On 21st August 1968 it was clear, just as it was on 13th August 1961. And thus it came to pass that the *Flottgarter Zeitung* wrote on 23rd August 1968:

"The 21st August marks the end of a phase of post-war policy that began eight years ago ... (today) we have come to the end of the so-called policy of bridge-building."

We are gratified at this, even though it does not mean that we shall relax our vigilance. When one knows how great conspiracies and plots are organized and contrived, then one also knows that they will never cease as long as imperialism exists.

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin, September 4, 5 and 6, 1968)

**On the
Situation
in the
Czechoslovak
Socialist
Republic**

II

Contents

The Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia	5
From Hitler's Aggression to Bonn's Eastern Policy	18
Mass Media, Freedom of the Press and the I.P.I.	28
The Great Conspiracy	35
I. Secret Agents Attack	35
II. The Psychological War	41
III. The "Helping" Hands	47
Unwardly Ravenous Wolves	54
The Position of the Workers in the Class Struggle between Socialism and Imperialism	62
The Intellectual Vanguard of the Counter-Revolution	76
Wehner and Brandt Lament their Defeat	94
The Anti-Socialist Economic Program of Mr. Ota Šik	99
Against Fischer at the End of an Illusion	112
The Revisionist Game of Chess with Imperialism	117
What Was Blessing Doing in Prague?	128

A "Spring Trip" – Seen in the Retrospective
Program out of the Background
True and False Unity

The Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia

Our two parties have been linked by fraternal bonds for decades. This friendship and militant community is solidly based on Marxism-Leninism, in the joint struggle for socialism and for the safeguarding of peace in Europe. In the spirit of proletarian internationalism we close militant alliance of our two parties has stood the test in many complicated and difficult situations. As the consistent revolutionary parties of our countries we jointly fought imperialist war and fascism, and the German communists and anti-fascist resistance fighters will never forget the help and support the Czech and Slovak comrades and working people gave them in the struggle against Hitler fascism.

The liberation of our peoples and countries from the yoke of fascism by the Soviet Union with which we are linked in unswerving friendship, the establishment of the workers' and farmers' rule in the GDR and in neighbouring Czechoslovakia and the transition of our states to the construction of the socialist system gave our friendship, cooperation and militant alliance a new higher quality. It became state policy. The duty to assist each other is as intrinsic to the nature of proletarian internationalism as is the way in which communists, Marxist-Leninists, as allies in struggle, frankly discuss questions which have to be tackled in the interests of our common struggle to develop socialist society and fight the enemy of the peoples, imperial-

ism. Our party proceeds from the fact that the relations between our parties are conducted on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and that problems are solved in the spirit of proletarian internationalism as is appropriate to the good traditions of our long military association.

It is a fact that during the past few months the developments in Czechoslovakia and the policy of the CPCZ have caused much concern among the members of our party and all strata of the people of the German Democratic Republic. Both the GDR and Czechoslovakia lie on the line dividing socialism from capitalism. Their geographical position puts them in the front line of the class struggle against West German imperialism and militarism. In firm alliance with the USSR, the main force of the socialist community of peoples, they have the task of decisively opposing the aggressive plans of monopoly capitalism in West Germany for changing the status quo in Europe, and causing them to fail.

In view of this situation and the sharpening of the class struggle between imperialism and socialism, the leadership of the CPCZ has not taken into consideration the significance and position of Czechoslovakia in the struggle between the two world systems in Europe. It allowed the anti-socialist, bourgeois-nationalist and rightist forces in Czechoslovakia which have obviously been organized for a long time to start an outright attack on the leading role of the CPCZ and against the socialist order.

Accounts Not Finally Settled with Capitalist Past

Characteristic in the development of Czechoslovakia since 1948 has no doubt been the fact that the working class, the peasantry and the other strata of the working people, under the leadership of the CPCZ, accomplished, in a historically short period, significant per-

formances and had big successes in the construction of socialism. Since 1948 Czechoslovakia's industrial production rose more than five-and-a-half fold; in the same period the national income trebled. A large-scale industrial and economic development completely changed the face of Slovakia. Unlike the bourgeois Czechoslovak Republic under Masaryk and Benes which was politically and economically dependent on the big capitalist powers and was at the mercy of the big imperialist powers, liberated Czechoslovakia, thanks to the efforts of its working peoples and the other socialist countries, successfully went about building socialism.

Our experiences and those of the working class and their Marxist-Leninist parties in the other socialist countries teach us that only the consistent application of the generally valid laws of development of the construction of socialist society leads forward on the road to socialism. This requires that the communist parties of the socialist countries creatively work out the strategy of the development of socialist society under the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution. It is there that grave omissions and mistakes occurred in Czechoslovakia which the former leadership of the CPCZ failed to overcome.

The social and economic foundations of socialism were created with the victory of socialist relations of production in Czechoslovakia and the development of industry. The shaping of socialist society, however, requires more. The working class must be enabled to consciously manage and organize its state; the working peasantry must become the class of cooperative farmers; the leadership of party and state must closely cooperate with the working class, the cooperative farmers and the intelligentsia; outdated conceptions widespread among the intelligentsia and other sections of the people must be overcome; through a likewise consistent and patient alliance policy socialist democracy must grow under the conditions of the

workers' and farmers' power, which is a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. There were hardly any attempts in Czechoslovakia to cope with the difficult task of creating the economic system of socialism accordingly developing the state and ideological superstructure.

Due to the absence of a thorough settling of accounts with the capitalist past and the failure to explain to the people the truth about the big-bourgeois capitalist policy of Benes as had been expounded by Comrade Gottwald, misconceptions about the bourgeois state of the Czechoslovak Republic were not discarded and became elements hampering socialist development. Here is one of the essential reasons why sections of the former bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intelligentsia were oriented on the West to a degree that they subordinated their love for their socialist fatherland to those sympathies. Instead of courageously tackling the basic tasks of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism they were subject to procrastination.

Our party therefore supported the relevant decision adopted at the January and May plenums of the Central Committee of the CPCZ convinced that their gradual implementation would help to surmount the accumulated mistakes and shortcomings and, in going ahead, solve the problems of further socialist development, provided that the CPCZ progressively consolidated its leading role. Events in Czechoslovakia, however, as is known, took a different course. Instead of energetically setting about these tasks, the mass media were transferred to the petty-bourgeois forces. The heroic past of the CPCZ and the twenty years of socialist construction were drawn through the mud, past errors and weaknesses occurring were magnified and the CPCZ and socialism were even blamed for the difficulties caused by imperialism. The CPCZ was denied the moral right to the leadership of society.

Open Doors and Open Borders to Bourgeois Ideology

Citizens of the GDR cannot understand why the Czechoslovak party and state leadership permitted the mass media, in which revisionist circles had long concentrated, to place themselves outside the party and state power. In this way the mass media became centres of anti-socialist and nationalist propaganda and virtual instruments of those forces which under the guise of "correcting the mistakes of socialism" called into question the socialist order itself. Prague became a favourite destination of propagandists and hucksters of imperialism paid to soften up and undermine socialism. Officials loyal to socialism and the party were largely displaced and in many cases exposed to political and psychological pressure. After January the mass media launched an increasingly frenetic anti-Soviet campaign. Doors, gates and borders were opened to bourgeois ideology. An anti-socialist opposition, counter-revolutionary in nature and content quickly formed which more and more overtly appeared as a counter force to the Communist Party and the socialist state power.

We believed it to be also our fraternal duty to express our attitude towards the conceptions announced in Czechoslovakia as the "new model of socialism", all the more since we have met many of its elements in the writings of bourgeois and social democratic ideologists and theorists of the convergence theory. They recommend "the abolition of central state planning at a time when state monopoly capitalism is engaged in the maximum concentration of its political and economic means. They seek to orient the socialist economy of Czechoslovakia on cooperation with the capitalist monopolies, with the justification of being better able to implement the scientific and technological revolution. In reality this would lead Czechoslovakia into dependency on imperialism. In addition no imperialist state is interested in promoting the

scientific and technological progress of a socialist country. They propagated an absolute freedom of opinion, the press and assembly, which in practice turned out, as is known, to be freedom for the socialist forces and bourgeois ideologists and the lack of freedom for those disseminating socialist ideology. Under the slogan of "separating the party from power" and of political "pluralism" they demanded the mission of opposition parties, with the help of which in the final analysis the bourgeois republic of Masaryk and Benes was to be brought back. They opposed the leading role of the working class, claiming leadership for the intellectuals—for those circles which were already able to be the most eager champions of bourgeois ideology in Czechoslovakia. Unfortunately, some of these conceptions irreconcilable with Marxism-Leninism are also reflected in the CPCZ action program which was adopted at the plenary session of the Central Committee in April. Therefore in the following period, revisionist and anti-socialist forces could refer to the CPCZ action program in spreading their harmful views.

In soberly and critically rethinking about events in their country, the Czechoslovak communists and the working people of Czechoslovakia, our class brothers will understand how concerned we were to see the socialist development threatened.

Taken in by Bonn's "New Eastern Policy"

Our deep concern about the socialist future of Czechoslovakia grew all the more since the imperialists, especially the West German militarists and revisionists, had long been conspiring with anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia, and within the framework of the global strategy of US imperialism had selected Czechoslovakia as the main goal of their penetration of the community of socialist states. They considered Czechoslovakia as the weakest link in the front of the socialist

states. Now the creeping counter-revolution was to achieve what they had been unsuccessful in doing in 1948 thanks to the revolutionary action of the Czechoslovak working class led by the CPCZ. The long-term strategic plan of the West German imperialists had as its aim the "peaceful conversion" of Czechoslovakia into a social democratically trimmed bourgeois state. This imperialist conspiracy against Czechoslovakia was completely worked out and carried out in a staff-like manner.

As part of this plan West German politicians and Bundestag deputies, bank presidents and industrialists were sent to Prague disguised as journalists, to organize their centres on the spot and to support those forces bent on a policy of "opening towards the West". On the other hand, the West German monopoly capitalist press placed their columns and the radio and television services their transmissions at the disposal of Czechoslovak intellectuals such as Svitak, Goldstücker, Liehm, Kohout, Prohazka and many others. Under the cloak of the slogans of "liberalization" and "democratization" they became advisers on how to disintegrate the CPCZ and undermine the socialist order. It is no coincidence that representatives of the anti-socialist clubs and revisionist circles of Czechoslovakia appeared in the mass media of West German imperialism and washed Czechoslovak linen there. Their close political and material relations had existed for a long time. Prohazka, Sik and others had no scruples about placing themselves in the service of psychological warfare against the GDR and preaching cooperation with the monopoly capitalist West German Federal Republic.

The mass media of Czechoslovakia and statements by responsible leaders revealed with increasing clearness the underestimation or playing down of the danger emerging from the expansionist and revisionist policy of West German imperialism. The talk of the social democratic ministers about a European peace order, relaxation and understanding were ac-

cepted at face value. They were blind to the role of the social democratic ministers as accessories of the Kiesinger-Strauss government and they were taken by the "new eastern policy".

But what aims was the Kiesinger-Strauss government following with the full support of the social democratic ministers? Both before and after 21 August Kiesinger declared it was the task of the West German Federal Republic "to alter the status quo". This is precisely Strauss's objective of a European new order in which "the East European countries are severed from their present connection with the Soviet Union and brought into the sphere of interests of the Federal Republic". This very aim is pursued by the global strategy of US imperialism and its Bonn variant, "the new eastern policy".

Joint Line of March Laid Down in Karlovy Vary and Bratislava

The Czechoslovak communists will agree with us that the revolutionary party of the German working class has the most experience with the reactionary and aggressive character of German imperialism and the role of the rightwing social democratic leaders. All questions related to policy towards West Germany are directly linked with the class struggle on German soil, which is closely interlinked with the struggle for European security. Our joint line of march was announced in the declaration of the communist and workers' parties of Karlovy Vary in 1967 and the Bratislava declaration of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries. In view of the dangerous developments and with concern for the safeguarding of socialism in Czechoslovakia, the communist and workers' parties of the Soviet Union, the GDR, Poland, Hungary and Bulgaria did all they could to render all possible political assistance to the CPCZ in overcoming the ever more dangerous situa-

tion. This was served by the deliberations of Dresden, Moscow, Warsaw, Cierna and Bratislava, the consultations between the SED and the CPCZ in Karlovy Vary and the discussions between the party and state leaderships of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia in August and October in Moscow.

The declaration of Bratislava which was signed by the representatives of all fraternal parties point the way on which to develop reciprocal relations among the socialist countries on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, further to consolidate the community of socialist states and systematically and comprehensively to advance socialist society in our countries. This requires primarily that the Marxist-Leninist parties be strictly and consistently guided by the general laws of development of the construction of socialist society, that the leading role of the working class and its vanguard, the communist party, be strengthened, that the principles of Marxism-Leninism be unflinchingly adhered to, that the popular masses be educated in the spirit of the ideas of socialism and proletarian internationalism and that an implacable struggle be conducted against bourgeois ideology and all anti-socialist forces.

No effort was spared in helping the CPCZ to find a political solution to the crisis in Czechoslovakia. But the measures jointly agreed on were not consistently applied and the situation in Czechoslovakia deteriorated more and more.

Why Does the CPCZ Leadership Hide the Gravity of the Situation?

Our Czechoslovak comrades will understand that the members of our party and many citizens of our Republic asked why the CPCZ leadership did not tell the truth about the gravity of the situation. Why does it hide to the party and the people the measures

agreed on? Why does the CPCZ still fail to community of socialist states, remained open. The solidate more speedily the ideological and organizational measures of the five socialist states on 21 August, national unity of the party and the socialist consciousness, mobilize the working class and the people, order to check the anti-socialist forces and resolute take up the struggle against bourgeois ideology, place the mass media in the hands of staunch communists and Marxist-Leninist journalists, drive the spies of imperialist intelligence services out of the country and, in going ahead, eliminate the difficulties by relying on the fraternal alliance with the socialist states, primarily with the Soviet Union?

Today, even though sporadically, leading officials of the CPCZ answer this question by declaring that no serious efforts had been made to carry out the measures agreed upon for the protection of socialism. In fact a number of prominent party leaders had carried on a sort of double dealing, a policy of duplicity. They voiced their agreement with the jointly fixed steps and signed them, but never really intended to carry them out. This also explains why they did not publicize the agreements.

Therefore, the five socialist brother countries, hastening to the aid of the Czechoslovak peoples on 21 August this year and defending socialist Czechoslovakia against imperialism and counter-revolution acted in full harmony with the declaration of Bratislava, which had also been signed by the CPC leadership. The imperialist plans for withdrawing Czechoslovakia from the community of socialist states were thus frustrated. The western border of the community of socialist states was reliably protected against the aggressive expansionist West German NATO state pressing for expansion. The open appearance of counter-revolutionary elements was stopped, and the imperialist circles in the West were prevented from undermining Czechoslovakia. Also this attempt to alter the status quo in Europe was foiled. Thus the road towards European security which above all presupposes the consolidation of the com-

Should there be reason for anybody to shed tears about 21 August it is Kiesinger and Strauss, and also Adenauer and Brandt whose plans were shipwrecked on that day. They had to recognize that nobody will at any time be allowed to drive a wedge between the socialist states and break even a single link out of the community of socialist states.

The members of our party and our working people very attentively follow what is being done in Czechoslovakia to fulfil the agreements made in Moscow on 6 August. They do not overlook the fact that the process of genuine normalization of the situation in the CSSR is progressing extremely slowly and with contradictions. One of the reasons for this is that until today there has been no clear, Marxist-Leninist assessment of developments since January of this year. Even now anti-socialist, anti-Soviet and anti-Marxist conceptions are disseminated in the press, radio and television, instead of using these media for strengthening the class positions of the workers and turning the popular masses with the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

Our Community of Struggle Calls for Joint Action

To those who reproach us with misunderstanding the psyche of the Czechoslovak peoples we reply that the national interests of the peoples of Czechoslovakia and also the interests of all socialist states require a rebuff to the imperialist plots and an open word. The time has now come for the working people, in

alliance with the cooperative farmers and social intelligentsia to show that they are better able to direct the policies of the state than those intellectuals who receive their ideas from the West and who do not believe in the strength of the working class. Vague phrases bring neither the economy nor the social development forward. For this the consistent fulfilment of the agreements of Cierna, Bratislava and Moscow is essential as is a fundamental and truthful assessment of developments in Czechoslovakia from January to August of this year. The normalization of the situation in Czechoslovakia will be all the more successful if the healthy forces within the CPCZ and the people have their say, people who, in a time of mass hysteria, petty bourgeois and nationalist confusion in the country, preserved their honour as communists and thought and acted as genuine patriots and internationalists.

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin edition, 23rd vol., No. 305 of November 3, 1968)

As Marxists-Leninists and allies of the CPCZ and the Czechoslovak working people we expect the CPCZ in carrying out the jointly worked out decision to strengthen the leading role of the working class and its party as a militant Marxist-Leninist organization and, as is said in the Bratislava declaration constantly to work to "raise the political activity of the working class, the farmers, the intelligentsia and all working strata, for all-round progress of the socialist social order, the further consolidation of socialist democracy, the perfection..... of the activity of party and state in accordance with the principle of democratic centralism".

The relations between the SED and the CPCZ, like those linking all Marxist-Leninist parties, have a principled basis. They are relations which always are and must be directed at the flourishing of socialism in our countries, the interests of the community of socialist states and the international revolutionary working-class movement. The Czechoslovak communists may rest assured that our party and the parties of the other socialist countries are ready to

help the CPCZ and the peoples of Czechoslovakia to overcome their difficulties and to develop their socialist society. Our militant alliance calls for joint action. We feel that it is necessary to have a frank discussion between our parties and their leaderships and to re-establish the traditional relations between the party organs.

Under the banner of Marxism-Leninism our two parties have gone a long and sacrificial road of struggle—jointly and in fraternal unity with the most experienced section of the international communist movement, the CPSU. This is the solid foundation on which, in future, too, the SED and the CPCZ will march along, shoulder to shoulder, on the joint road of socialism.

From Hitler's Aggression to Bonn's Eastern Policy

by Lorenz

Of all the political forces in Germany in the year 1938/39 the German communists and their anti-fascist allies in the United and Popular Front were the only ones who determinedly and without waverin opposed the plans of rapacious German imperialis which divided and subjugated Czechoslovakia. The opposition to these plans was carried out with grav risk to the lives and freedom of thousands of the be in their ranks.

These forces not only challenged the Munich conspiracy, which enabled Britain, France and Italy to sell Czechoslovakia out to Hitler Germany, but the also at the same time exposed the peace phraseolog of Chamberlain, Daladier and Mussolini both insid Germany itself and in the international arena. The showed how the dividing of Czechoslovakia was a decisive step in the march of German imperialism an militarism towards the great war, the Second World War.

The Communist Party of Germany in its official documents took a firm stand against the splitting of of the so-called Sudeten German areas from the Czechoslovak Republic, against the creation of the so-called Reich Protectorates of Bohemia and Moravia as well as against the somewhat different form of a protectorate in Slovakia.

The aim of the German finance and armament

nagates, which was strongly condemned by the communist Party of Germany, was to create a colonial area in the heart of Europe from which they could extract raw materials, industrial goods and agricultural produce to satisfy their immense greed for profits.

Today it has become a burning necessity to recall these historical truths. This is not only so because thirty years have passed since the well-prepared rapacious attack of German imperialism on the Czech and Slovakian peoples, but mainly because of German imperialism's anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary subversive activity against socialist Czechoslovakia carried on under the guise of its so-called New Eastern Policy.

It is sure that the conditions of our time, that is the world-wide transition from capitalism to socialism, are different from those of 1938/39. The powerful Soviet Union and the allied socialist countries are in a position to frustrate all imperialist attacks against the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, as events over the past few weeks have clearly demonstrated. By defending socialism they are in a position to further guarantee the national existence of the Czech and Slovak peoples, the territorial integrity and sovereignty of their state.

On German territory there exists a firm and ever more consolidating socialist state, the German Democratic Republic. Here the struggle against reactionism and against all forms of the vicious plans of German imperialism for conquest, as well as the struggle for European security and world peace, form the basis of state policy, they have become state doctrine. The G.D.R.'s foreign and home policies are to a great extent determined by those German communists and anti-fascists who were the only force in Germany in 1938/39 to wage a consistent struggle against the division of Czechoslovakia by the German imperialists. They were the only ones to stand up for the national independence and territorial integrity

of the Czechoslovak Republic. The G.D.R. is a factually untenable "Ethnic Group Law". All this, member of the socialist defence community in Europe with equal rights and obligations. The powerful force of the allied socialist countries is at the same time a firm guarantee for security in Europe and the sovereign existence of the European peoples.

Munich Policy with Changed Methods

The change of the constellation of forces in Europe nevertheless has not led to what credulous illusionists would like us to believe, namely that German imperialism has given up its plans for the conquest and domination of other countries. All that has changed and that only, partly, are the ways, means and methods with which German imperialism tries to pursue its aims. Government officials and other personalities, now carrying different names and wearing different party labels, are acting on Bonn's political scene in conformity with the spirit and aims of German imperialism. But the aims and intentions of the foreign policy of the imperialist West German state are still determined by the same old strivings of German imperialism for hegemony in Europe in order to achieve and secure maximum profits for the monopolist capitalists.

The Bonn government, including the Social Democratic ministers, is unanimous in its refusal to recognize the Munich Agreement as being null and void from the very beginning. On the contrary, it intends that one finds in this government's declaration of intent is that it "is conscious of its obligations to protect the Sudeten German fellow countrymen like all other expelled persons and refugees", and that Bonn will take this obligation seriously. With this Kiesinger government embraces the "right to homeland" which is incompatible with international law and which was extended by Herbert Wehner to the

factually untenable "Ethnic Group Law". All this, propagating under the slogan of the "right to self-determination", serves to propagate the old revanchist plans in a new way.

Dr Walter Becher, a confidant of Bonn's Finance Minister Franz Josef Strauss and spokesman of the Association of Sudeten German Fellow Countrymen", disclosed in the Sudetendeutsche Zeitung the new methods with which the old revanchist aims are going to be realized:

"... the best form of a credit grant and economic aid to Czechoslovakia would be to reintegrate the Sudeten German entrepreneurs and their qualified workers, to reinstate Bohemian-Silesian Germanism in their homeland which they have built up but never gained by force."

It is clear that the matter concerned here is the return of those areas which were handed over to German imperialism through the Munich conspiracy. The very same imperialist forces are again in power in the West German Federal Republic. In their plans and intentions against Czechoslovakia the West German monopolies go even further than Becher, spokesman of the revenge-seeking groups. The contacts they had maintained for years with anti-socialist, so-called reform communists were expected to effect a political transformation in Prague which would at the same time hit directly at the socialist order in Czechoslovakia as a

With these intentions in mind the West German monopolies and finance capitalists have concerned themselves for a long time with economic infiltration into the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. First of all the aim was to disturb, limit and possibly reverse the country's economic cooperation and coordination with the other fraternal socialist countries which were established after 1945. The economy of Czechoslovakia was increasingly to be orientated to and made dependent on the economy of the western imperialist

countries. For this end Ota Šik and other "economic reformists" served as active accomplices in Czechoslovakia. The orientation of Czechoslovakia's economy towards the West would bring with it unemployment and a lowering of the living standards in wide sections of the Czechoslovak working class. This questionable result of these reforms is in effect till now the saddling of Czechoslovakia with foreign liabilities to the tune of 500 million dollars in the form of short term high interest credits from the West. The monopoly and finance magnates consider this an ideal way of bringing about economic dependence which at a later stage could be used as a means of political blackmail.

Thus we see the old imperialist methods of applied in a changed form. On October 15, 1938, Dr Hans Neuwirth, then deputy of the Sudeten German Party, who is today a member of the "Sudeten German Council" and also serves in the Bonn Foreign Office, wrote to Hitler's Foreign Office:

"One leaves the Czechs to themselves, pins down the remnant of the state economically, raises the rate and tempo of the resulting deterioration of social living conditions and through this encourages the strivings of the Slovaks for independence as a separate state, and then uses as a pretext the inevitable disturbances and social as well as economic difficulties to take over these historic countries by force and place them under the jurisdiction of the German Reich."

Also today economic infiltration and the creation of economic dependence obviously serves the political aims of West German imperialism although it now has to resort to other tactics, because of the existence of the socialist countries. Franz Joseph Strauss put in a nutshell when he said: The Federal Republic can no longer be an economic giant and at the same time remain a political dwarf.

Franz Josef Strauss consciously makes use of the financial and economic resources of the Bonn govern-

ment to undermine the socialist order in the east European countries, and to further his chauvinistic plan for a "Greater Europe".

One of the most important obstacles blocking the realization of West German imperialism's European plans is the existence of the German Democratic Republic. Thus it is understandable that in West German industrial and financial circles the illusionary hopes were propagated that by a triumph of the anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia also the fate of the German Democratic Republic would be sealed. In the event of such a happening West German imperialism in relation to West Berlin would use a different language towards the socialist countries and even its western allies.

This position urgently necessitated the taking of measures by the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries as a contribution towards thwarting the activities of West German imperialism against Czechoslovakia. By this the German Democratic Republic remained faithful to the legacy of all German anti-fascists, who waged a heroic struggle against German fascism and German imperialism thirty years ago and for defending the national independence of the Czechoslovak people.

Pluralism as a Method for Undermining

Socialism and the Unity of the State

The Bonn government and its propaganda machine favours in particular the introduction of the so-called pluralistic party system in socialist Czechoslovakia. The aim of this pluralist policy was to disrupt the unity of the Czechoslovak working class and the leading role of the Communist Party there. It was intended to oust the Czechoslovak Communist Party step by step from the leadership of the people, the state and the economy and to replace it by other political

parties. The Bonn ruling circles placed particular hope on the publications, *Literární Listy* and *Literární Noviny* edited by anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary writers. The editorial boards of both the publications were, according to Bonn's thinking, to carry out "communist opposition" in order to use them as a veil for safeguarding themselves against being accused of following bourgeois and revisionist policies. These methods, too, are fully in line with the proved practices of German imperialism's expansionist policy. In November 1937 Henlein submitted a memorandum to Hitler on the Sudeten German Party and wrote:

"As a party in the democratic parliamentary system of Czechoslovakia it... must use for external consumption democratic terminology and democratic parliamentary methods. At heart I cherish no wish as warmly as the integration of the whole of the Sudeten area, and even all Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia into the German Reich."

When one replaces "democratic" by words like "socialist" or "communist" and "parliamentary system" with "National Front" or "National Assembly" the one will recognize with surprise that the method which the West German revenge-seekers recommended to their agents in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic are not essentially different from those of the Hitler fascists. Kiesinger and many of his colleagues have gained and brought with them considerable experience from their service for Hitler which they now use in implementing the foreign policy of the Federal Republic.

Also belonging to such practices is the exploitation of national differences between the Czechs and the Slovaks. In 1938 a note in Hitler's Foreign Office freely made use of the expression "right of self-determination". With this expression as the catchphrase an independent Czechoslovakia was encouraged. The following quotation reveals the intention of German imperialism in relation to this matter

"Large timber resources, a part of the Czechoslovak arms industry in the Slovakian area (*Waag- and-Grantal*)... in any case a suitable prerequisite for an intensive economic interlinking with Germany, common frontiers would come into being. An independent Slovakia would be a weak state form and this would best promote the German needs to infiltrate and to get a settler's area in the East. The point of least resistance in the East."

The right to self-determination" in the service of the profit and conquest interests of German finance and monopoly capital—this reveals the downright hypocrisy of all the imperialist outcries about the right to self-determination of the people of the CSSR and of the other Socialist countries.

In connection with the much advocated pluralistic party system for the CSSR hope is placed, firstly, in certain West German circles in the rebirth of the former People's Party in Slovakia. This Party consisting of clerical fascists played a servile role to German fascism when it was dividing Czechoslovakia. The rebirth of this party, or one of a similar nature, was seen in Bonn as a suitable instrument for action against the Communist Party of Slovakia and the socialist order. Up to this very day the West German monopolies in relation to Slovakia still cherish their profit interests.

In this manner the policy of balkanising Czechoslovakia by fascist German imperialism in changed forms with different methods and altered phraseology reveals the rebirth of revanchism.

From Benes to Snejdarek

There are still further similarities between the methods of German imperialism and its henchmen in Czechoslovakia of those times and today. One remembers that the Soviet Union was the only great European power which was prepared to defend the Czechoslovak

slovak Republic against the attacks of Fascist Germany. For external consumption the leaders of the bourgeois Czechoslovak Republic put up the pretence that they would abide by the agreements with the Soviet Union. In their dealings with the diplomats of German imperialism, however, they sang a different tune. Hitler's envoy, Eisenlohr, was able to report to the Reich Foreign Office on February 16, 1938 on the talks he had with the then President Benes in the manner:

"He (Benes) is working out a way by which he could gradually come close to us (Fascist Germany) to clear the atmosphere until one day when good relations could even be publicly manifested... His pact with Russia is nothing but a remnant from an expiring epoch; he could not however just throw it in the waste paper basket. It is obvious that Professor Snejdarek, the Director of the Institute for International Relations in Prague was acting in the same way when he declared in talks with West German politicians that the C.S.S.R. was ready to give up all its preconditions about establishing diplomatic relations with Bonn if the Federal Republic were to take an acceptable attitude towards the Munich Treaty. Though publicly declaring loyalty to the Warsaw Pact the demands of the Warsaw Pact members were plainly abandoned in internal talks to the Bonn government.

Prof. Snejdarek, and we do not know from whom he received his mandate, complied with the wishes of Bonn Foreign Minister Brandt who had declared before the Austrian Society for Foreign Affairs, that he could not understand why the members of the Warsaw Pact take a specific stand against the Federal Republic, thus foregoing the opportunity to bring about improved relations with the Federal Republic

Conclusions

From all the known facts and events of the past and present in Czechoslovakia result a number of inevitable conclusions with convincing clarity.

1. The measures of the fraternal socialist countries who responded to the call of the conscious Czechoslovak party and state functionaries were necessary, correct and timely.

2. They have wrecked all the economic and political plans of Bonn's "Eastern Policy". West German imperialism and its revenge-seeking bands are the ones hit most severely by what happened in Czechoslovakia after August 21.

3. Protection and safeguard of socialist development are at the same time protection and safeguard of the national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

4. The measures for protecting socialist development in Czechoslovakia are an effective contribution to guaranteeing and securing peace in Europe, and are indeed an effective service in the interest of world peace.

(From Neues Deutschland, Berlin, September 1, 1968)

Mass Media, Freedom of the Press and the I.P.I.

by Prof. Dr Franz Knipping

In the loud-mouthed propaganda chorus of international reaction against the move of the five fraternal socialist countries there was a voice from Zurich which joined them. It belongs to an obscure enterprise which calls itself International Press Institute. The Director of the I.P.I., Per Monsen, linked his protest with the statement that the journalists in the C.S.S.R. had attained an "honourable place in the annals of world journalism". They therefore deserved the respect of their colleagues in the Western world.

The Mission of the Zurich Institute

The motives and background to these utterings become clear when one remembers the special role of the I.P.I. in the psychological warfare of imperialism. It was founded in 1951, during the time of the Cold War. Among those who give money to it are billionaires like Ford and Rockefeller and the leading newspaper magnates in the U.S.A. In recent years they have also been joined by some major West German press trusts.

At first the activities of the I.P.I. remained mainly limited to Europe. As time went on, this Institute dedicated itself to the infiltration of Asia and Africa. It was given instructions to obstruct the building of

in independent national press system in the developing countries, wherever possible. Though these efforts showed some success, the promoters and financiers expressed dissatisfaction. The U.S.A. delegate Lester Markel emphasized during last year's I.P.I. general meeting that it was as important to tackle the problems of the developed world at once. From the concept of the global strategists, no longer ready to meet socialism in a frontal attack, but to scrape it out from within—this brought about new tasks for the I.P.I. The Institute was expected to find out weak spots in the mass media of socialist countries and to establish contacts with suitable journalists and press men in these countries.

Ford as a Generous Contributor

Money must be mobilized for all this," so demanded Monsen and "only up to now there has been nothing to stimulate work." The I.P.I. had hardly approved of the new directive when money started flowing in. The I.P.I. information bulletin exalted "immediately after the general meeting news which gladdened the heart reached the Institute, that the Ford Foundation has granted a new allowance of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars."

This financial injection enabled the Institute to organize a seminar in Geneva in March 1968 for a group of press men from 21 countries. In contrast to the usual practice there were for the first time among those taking part some journalist from socialist countries. One of them demonstrated his gratitude to the organizers in a very striking way. He assured them that the meeting had given a new impetus to his journalistic work, and how very valuable for him the political and professional discussions of the seminar had been, including the whole exchange of views. This journalist, described as a "leftist" of the seminar is named Emil Sip. He was the editor of a leading

newspaper in Prague responsible for questions foreign policy.

The Confession of Emil Sip

Hardly had he returned to Prague when Emil Sip gave I.P.I. a detailed account of the press relations in his country. The information bulletin of the I.P.I. gave him report the title "a valuable historical document". The Institute expressed the wish that he would receive the acclaim he deserved—this was how it was termed the issue mentioned above: "The example set by the Czechoslovak press in the struggle for freedom could and should be infectious".

The contribution already referred to could be given the title "A Guide to the Organisation of Counter-Revolution through the Mass Media"—it incorporated a blue print for the effective operation of the press, radio and television in a socialist country in forming public opinion. With this the author unwittingly confirms the fundamental thesis that the mass media are at anytime and in every society, instruments for wielding power. Under socialist conditions, the mass media are an integral component of the power of the working people. Those who work in this field are therefore in a highly responsible position. Careless manipulation of these means of disseminating information, a misuse of the achievements of ideological mass communication for selfish purposes, contrary to the interests of socialist society therefore inevitably undermines the popular power. This was precisely the case in the C.S.S.R.

Opinion Monopoly of a Handful of Intellectuals

Sip mentions two basic conditions which were present in the Czechoslovak mass media after the January Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the

Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. It was possible for the journalists "to shake off both the controlling guidance of the leadership from above and the retaliative censorship from below." In other words: the influence of the leading political and social force, the revolutionary party of the working class, on the mass media was broken. At the same time, the press, radio and television were no longer subject to the social control of the working people. Freedom of the press and of opinion, which, in a socialist country, are inalienable rights, linked to the interests of the whole community, became the prerogative of a small group of intellectuals. They not only departed from the party but at the same time they fancied themselves to be superior to the people. In this way they were able to exploit the unique position of power which came into their hands, that is, power over the thoughts, feelings and actions of millions of people; in the end, this became a serious threat to the existence of socialist society.

The report of Emil Sip on the "political metamorphosis of the Czechoslovak press" clearly illustrates each stage of this process. Following his description of the situation, it can be seen that the anti-socialist escalation of the mass media went as follows:

Firstly: In order to undermine the leading role of the party in the field of guiding public opinion, the mass media needed at first the support of the party and its leading organs. A controlling influence over the majority of the most important publications came into the hands of the right-wing group which began to increase its activity after the January plenary session. These "militant elements" of the "revisionist wing"—in which Sip includes among others the economist Šik and the Pro Rector of the Charles University Goldstücker—gave the press "unconditional protection". At the same time, the radio and television, which in any case have a wider sphere of influence, played an important part, and naturally backed the press.

Working up the Readers into a State of Frenzy

Secondly: The transformation of the mass media into a mouthpiece for the expression of right-wing opinion ensured that maximum publicity was given to the activities of these forces: "Overnight, whole pages of the press and a large part of broadcasting time were given over to the representatives of the 'progressive' (or rather revisionist) wing of the Party; the people were suddenly inundated with requests for articles, interviews, appearances on television etc. It resulted in a literal competition between the mass media, to give the most detailed and up to date reports on the activities of the 'progressives'. On the other side of the coin: the columns of the press and the microphones were denied to the health care of the Party, the Marxist-Leninist forces. Only in exceptional cases could they still put their views before the public effectively.

Thirdly: Having at their disposal the mass media made it possible for the right-wing to conduct debate of an unprincipled and boundless retrogressive nature. This was done in such a manner "that the readers went into a frenzy which in turn paved the way for even greater pressure to be used toward the acceleration of the democratisation process." The impression that the twenty years of successful social development was but a succession of mistakes, was given to the recipients of the mass media. The establishment of the socialist state was represented as being the greatest mistake of all.

Fourthly: Making use of the pressure of public opinion which they themselves had systematically fermented and built up, those in control of the mass media began to further consolidate their position. The situation was described as follows: Some of the best-known newspapers took advantage of the circumstances to conduct "purges" and organized their own regeneration process." As a result, experienced journalists who were loyal supporters of the party

and of socialism were thrown out of work — a process which began in the trade union newspaper *Práce* and which soon spread to all the newspapers of Prague. Fifthly: Having "purged" the loyal party members from among their ranks, the various organs of the press let loose a campaign against the officers of the party and the mass organisations. This went so far that actual lists of names to be ousted were published. Thus, for instance, the editorial board of the trade union paper *Práce* organised a political discussion and campaign directed against the leadership—even though this was against the will of the trade union leaders. As a result all the "top people" had to resign unhonoured and unsung. This procedure was paralleled by other newspapers including the youth paper "*Mladá Fronta*".

Organizers of the Counter Revolution

Sixthly: Under the aspects of the "absolute freedom of the press and of opinion" being interpreted in this manner the Lenin theses confirmed themselves again: that the Press forms the centre and basis of political organisation. Under the prevailing conditions obviously with a clearly negative anti-socialist accent. The organizing function of the press expressed itself, for example, in the case of the "*Mladá Fronta*"; in the "rapid reorientation of the Czechoslovakian youth organisations". It resulted in the "preparation of an independent student's organisation", in the "founding of a Boy Scouts Movement" etc. Henceforth other mass media were not only able to "criticise the leading political personalities, from Premier to President, but even to organise protest meetings against the 'establishment' on their own part."

It now became clear that the situation which had developed was according to the plans of the imperialist strategists. One could read it in the *Ham-burger Spiegel* of August 28: freedom of opinion for

anti-socialist forces as a "preliminary stage toward freedom to establish political organisations". And this again as "the preliminary stage towards installing a pluralistic, i.e. a Western style parliamentary state". Which in plain English means nothing else but the restoration of the bourgeois state.

Seventhy: The I.P.I. informer, Sip, remarked "was especially interesting to see how quickly and thoroughly the Czechoslovak press evolved in the direction of the democratic newspapers of the West. This obviously by no means refers to the few Communist and other progressive publications in the capitalist countries. The monopoly press was made the ideal worth striving for and this was done with unwavering consistency. The imitation of western press practices increased in many places to an organized cooperation between the anti-socialist forces inside and outside the country. The columns of the Czechoslovak press were opened to professional anti-communists like the staff of the imperialist agents' centre, Radio Free Europe and others. At the same time, the more anti-socialist and provocative press agencies and politicians became, the wider was the field imperialist radio and television stations offered to them.

Today not the slightest doubt remains that the mass media in the C.S.S.R. by their organizing and scheming have brought about the dangerous situation which made inevitable the action of the five fraternal countries in order to protect socialism. Now, since the aim is to normalize the situation in the C.S.S.R. as soon as possible it is imperative that "effective steps in the interests of socialist power" particularly in the field of mass communication and its influence on forming public opinion, be taken. The implementation of the decisions of Cierna and the principles of Bratislava make it a matter of urgent necessity to secure the political leadership of the press, radio and television in the spirit of socialism. (From *Neues Deutschland* Berlin, September 3, 1968)

The Great Conspiracy

Harri Czepuck

Secret Agents Attack

The hands of the clock, synchronized by the imperialist global strategists in Bonn, Munich, Washington, Vienna and Prague, appeared to be moving inexorably towards zero hour in the C.S.S.R. Unofficially, they had allowed themselves about a week. The leaders of the counter-revolution, from Svitek to Šilk, were already outside the country for consultations. Inside the country, the way was open. Everything was in readiness.

The hour had struck. It was the night of the 1st August, 1968. The allied armies hastened to the assistance of the loyal socialist, patriotic and internationalist elements in the C.S.S.R.

Friends and enemies alike realized at that moment that the status quo in Europe was not going to be upset. The balance of power was not going to be altered in favour of imperialism. The global strategy of imperialism received a rude, and for some, incomprehensible, setback.

The proponents of the global strategy took the lesson to heart. But not so much those between the Atlantic Coast and the Black Sea who really believed that the events in the C.S.S.R. were purely an internal affair, that merely an attempt was being made to

correct the mistakes of the past so as to bring socialism in a better way.

These people were only victims of a manipulative strategy which was intended to serve as a cover one of the biggest imperialist attacks on social positions launched during the past twelve years.

Where it all Began

First let us give an account of what we know already about it. These facts alone will enable us to form an idea of this great conspiracy.

Immediately after the Second World War the imperialists attempted to regain the political, economic and strategic positions they had lost as a result of the changes that had rocked the world. The leading capitalist country, the U.S.A. started what was to become known in history as the "cold war". By every available means, socialism in Europe was to be "rolled back" and any efforts towards national and social liberation in the rest of the world were to be halted.

During this period (1947) the C.I.A. (Central Intelligence Agency) was inaugurated, built on the foundation of the O.S.S. (Office of Strategic Service) which had come into being during World War II.

The Chief of the O.S.S., General Donovan, had developed the theory that, if an enemy could not be overrun in the early stages by military force, a campaign of psychological warfare had to be undertaken in order to wear him down. This would facilitate the eventual military defeat.

After a period of transition the directorship of the C.I.A. was taken up by Allen Dulles, the brother of the then American Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. From this time on, the C.I.A. became an essential instrument of American foreign policy. What are not going to talk here about the coups d'état, civil wars, changes of governments for which the C.I.A. has been responsible. One could start with Guatemala in 1954 and end with the military coup in

Greece, without by any means having told the whole story.

The Old Man and the Address Book

Let us now for a while limit ourselves to the case of Czechoslovakia. The C.I.A. with its headquarters in the Washington township of Foggy Bottom, had been busy on its subversive activities against this country since 1948. It has almost 30,000 officers at its disposal, and, since 1951, has been spending 100 million dollars annually on its work in socialist countries alone.

The Munich publishers, Isarverlag, brought out a book by Joachim Joesten in 1958 which was called *CIA—Wie der amerikanische Geheimdienst arbeitet* (CIA, or how the American Secret Service Works). On page 31 of this book one finds the following interesting passage. "In a large bright office somewhere in Washington sits a well-groomed, Slav-looking gentleman. On his desk there is a pile of large books made of cheap paper and having broad cardboard backs. Dozens of volumes of a similar kind are standing on the shelves which line two walls of the room.

"The man is slowly turning over the pages of a volume which lies open in front of him. It is the address book of the city of Prague, issued in 1957. Carefully he ticks every name, row after row, checking every line. On every second or third page the searching finger stops. Now the old man turns to the 1956 issue of the same address book to compare two names and addresses. Now and then this 'name checker' stands up and goes to a big map of Prague which covers the third wall of his office. From a small box he takes a handful of pin-size flags of different colours. Now he pins a red one on No. 121 St. Wenceslas Square, then a blue one on a small alley in Josefov. Amidst the host of red and blue flags a green one is seen here and there.

"The old man was once a Professor at the University of Prague. He had taught Russian and History for many years before he entered the service of C.I.A. His present job is to assess the political and social changes in Prague as they occur year by year from his methodical study of the address books."

In this book Joesten recalls the case of a journalist one William Oatis, who was arrested for espionage in Czechoslovakia in 1951, and who was later released:

"It could be said almost with certainty that Oatis was no spy in the normal sense. But it is not possible that some of the material he collected instead of going to the Associated Press went, instead, to circles associated with the C.I.A."

In this, we have an interesting example of the way the C.I.A. operates, which also throws light on present-day events in the C.S.S.R.

In Search of Agents

A usually well-informed newspaper, the *Wall Street Journal*, made a very interesting confession in an issue of 24 February, 1967:

"There is no shortage of examples to illustrate the cooperation which exists between the C.I.A. and the news media. Erwin D. Canham, editor-in-chief of the *Christian Science Monitor* gave out the information that editors of his newspaper do, now and then, exchange information about development in foreign countries with members of the C.I.A."

"Other links between press representatives and the C.I.A. do exist. It is known, for example, that the C.I.A. approached some newspapers with the request that one of their agents should be employed on the staff as a foreign correspondent. The C.I.A. gave an assurance that the man in question was a competent journalist and that he would be in a position to fulfil his professional obligations satisfactorily." (translated from German—ed.)

Co-incidence or not?

To take a momentary jump into the present day: who could ever forget the flood of Western journalists which has been pouring into Czechoslovakia since last January, and even, to some extent, before then?

Let us take a few examples in which it is possible to indicate some strikingly similar patterns of movement. There is Herr Metitzky from the Second West German Television Station. The foreign registration number of the car in which he travels through Prague is changed daily. He arrived in Czechoslovakia in good time when the counter-revolution was still in its early stages. He arrived in Budapest in 1956, a few days before the counter-revolutionary coup, where he sat and awaited developments. Was this a coincidence?

There are the reporters of the Vienna yellow press, which is owned by the Austrian counterpart of Springer, Herr Molden. Molden publishes, as has already been said, books and programmes of the counter-revolutionary forces of the C.S.S.R. to whom he also gives substantial financial support. Among the authors they publish are: Antonin Liehm, editor-in-chief of *Literarny Listy*; Ota Šik, the prime mover of the anti-socialist economic programme; Ludwig Vauculik, the author of the "2,000 Words" and Eduard Goldstücker, one of the ideologists behind the counter-revolutionary movement in the C.S.S.R.

What has all this got to do with the C.I.A.? Simply this: Herr Molden is the son-in-law of Allen Dulles.

Or to take another example: at the peak of the period of counter-revolutionary activity in the C.S.S.R., Herr Heinz Schewe appeared in Prague as a correspondent for Springer's daily *Die Welt*. In his ordinary capacity he is the paper's correspondent in Tel Aviv. Herr Schewe, who was the correspondent of *Die Welt* in Moscow from 1957 to May 1967, was sent to Tel Aviv exactly ten days before the Israeli aggression.

Now he is in Prague at a very timely moment. Is this co-incidence?

One perhaps does not only have to point to Springer's close connections with the various secret service organizations and government departments in order to cast doubts on the "co-incidental" nature of these matters. One can also point out personal and private connections, as in the case of Molden. Springer's fourth wife is the daughter of Sarre, the big business magnate. She is also the niece of General Schulze of Gaevernitz, a close friend of Allen Dulles, whom he assisted in Switzerland in his talks with S.S. General Wolff, shortly before the end of the war.

But let us return to the long-term planning method of the C.I.A. There is yet another method which has also had obvious effectiveness in the C.S.S.R. In the previously quoted *Wall Street Journal* one finds the following:

"The web of connections between the C.I.A. and private businesses stretches upwards to include commercial enterprise—particularly the giant concerns whose activities are world-wide."

The newspaper then lists a number of universally known companies. Let us take only one example: "The Kaiser Jeep Corp., a subsidiary company of the Kaiser Industries Corp., stated that the C.I.A. came to them and asked them to prepare a report on an advertising survey which had taken 25 managers and staff members of the company to several East European countries, including Poland, Czechoslovakia and Rumania. A representative of the Kaiser firm declared: 'We were of the opinion that we should work with them.'"

1,500 C.I.A. Agents

Who bothers to count the number of business representatives or investigate their "business" in the Prague Hotels "Alacron", "Esplanade" or "Jalta"?

In the meantime, however, it is known that 30 Cze-

choslovak emigrants serving in the U.S. Army who were dressed in plain clothes crossed the Czechoslovak border from Austria. In Bad Tölz members of the 10th Special Forces Group assembled with the objective of crossing over into Czechoslovakia. The Schwarzenberg barracks near Salzburg, the Fighting Forces School No.1 in Hammelburg, Bavaria, the Airborne Troops and Transport School in Schongau all served as rallying points for such "specialists".

One thing is clear; according to a report by the American writer Art Shields—at the beginning of August, 1,500 C.I.A. agents were on Czechoslovak territory.

The secret service agencies are only a political instrument whose conception was designed by others. Their creators are the monopolists, who have strong economic interests, and the politicians representing these interests.

II. The Psychological War

The secret services, above all the C.I.A., did not only record results. They laid the basis for heavy defeats of imperialism whenever they incorrectly assessed the constellation of forces. Without departing from their entire strategy, which also determines the work of the secret services, the imperialists drew a number of conclusions from this, which necessitated variation of the tactics employed.

With Johnson's policy of "bridge-building" the struggle against the socialist countries shifted more and more, if not to say absolutely, to the field of psychological warfare and ideological struggle.

In Europe a main ally offered its services to this end: the West German Federal Republic. It was, without any shadow of a doubt, created to be used as a battering-ram against the socialist development in Europe. During Adenauer's chancellorship it played the role assigned to it, a role which was increasingly

in harmony with its own big-power interests that we ever more clearly coming to the fore. It continues to play this role because its ambitions to win hegemony in Europe have grown. But through its clear defeat on August 13, 1961, it became obvious that a direct frontal attack is now no longer possible.

So together with Kennedy's "peace strategy" (which began at the same time as the open aggression in Vietnam) and Johnson's "bridge building" policy (propagated at the same time as the escalation in Vietnam, the aggression in the Middle East and the military putsch in Greece) West Germany's "new eastern policy" came into being. It is as we have already shown a smokescreen concealing an aggressive and expansionist policy.

Thus all the theories which we now hear about the "new eastern policy" is not at all new.

The Recipe

In February 1962, no less than Theodor Oberländer, then a Minister in the Bonn Government with his experience in subversive activities set out the aims of psychological warfare as follows, in the military journal *Der Stahlhelm* (2/62):

"It is war without a visible beginning. It is declared like a military war, nor does it begin with the marching-in of troops; it starts invisibly through journalism, infiltration and the sending-in of spies. In fact, it is all the more successful the lesser it attracts attention, the lesser it arouses defence forces. This revolutionary war must be waged thoroughly on the borders of democracy... to wage it thoroughly does not only mean to bring the people into action but also to direct the whole state system, the general political line of the government and the platform of the parties along these lines."

On reading this we are automatically drawn to the developments which we had witnessed for months in Czechoslovakia up to August 21. Here we have the

recipe which the counter-revolutionary forces at home and abroad employ: the war began "almost invisibly through journalism".

When in January the weekly *Literární Listy* was published by a circle of open counter-revolutionaries around Antonín Liehm the silent war against socialism in the Č.S.S.R. began to manifest itself.

The number 0 edition included a lesson in social democracy entitled "The tradition which we want to develop" by Professor Goldstücker as well as a contribution by a historian named Fischer who wrote on the importance of Thomas Masaryk to Czech history.

Following this a Masaryk cult came into being throughout Czechoslovakia. His picture appeared in the shops and postcards carrying his portrait were sold by the millions. Thus Masaryk was put forward as the alternative to socialism. He was the man who from his bourgeois position set out to bring independence for Czechoslovakia fifty years ago but at the same time bargained it with Paris and London. He was the man who created the domination of the big bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia and whose policy ultimately led to 1938.

Not a word is said about the fact that in those times one Czech worker in every eight was unemployed, that Slovakia was an underdeveloped country and that in the north Bohemian coal districts there were hunger uprisings. Not a word. Yet Masaryk was made into an idol and the whole press which had been visibly engaged in psychological warfare since January, suddenly measured socialism in accordance with Masaryk's policy.

Obviously: One factor favoured these forces and they knew how to use it to their advantage. For years the Czechoslovak Communist Party had neglected the ideological field. It had not prepared or equipped the party membership and the whole population for ideological struggle. So the opponents found a ready-made vacuum and filled it. The example of Masaryk is only one of many.

Social Democracy

In the "invisible" journalistic war, which, in fact became ever more visible, the concept of "democratic socialism" played an ever growing role. It is not to nothing that the West German Social Democratic leaders joined in this concept of "democratic socialism" although in their own country, the Federal Republic, they threw both socialism and democracy overboard.

What they did in a refined way was to set this process in motion through their spiritual infiltration Professor Klaus Mehnert, the Kremlin astrologist clearly assessed this in West German television on March 30 when he said:

"This means developments in a direction which would have gravely irritated Lenin, namely toward social democracy, democratic socialism in Czechoslovakia... It would therefore be logical if, even there, social democracy took over the reins one day."

What this means is clear, when one knows how the right-wing social democrats deal with the working class in the ideological field and that they are aiding the bourgeoisie.

Without Communists

An article appeared in *Literární Listy* in which its author, Václav Havel, rejected the leading role of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (other press organs also came strongly out in support of this concept) and promoted the possibility of a "legal opposition" because he deemed necessary the "formation of political will outside the Communist Party".

Here the aim is openly worked out: Forming a "Social Democratic opposition" to the Communist Party under the motto: first share power with the communists and then exclude them altogether.

On June 27, 1968, the editorial in the *Münchener Merkur* noted with satisfaction:

"If a thing like this happened not only in Czechoslovakia but in the whole Eastern bloc, it could mean the end of communism".

The infiltration was systematically pursued.

What had been demanded for years by the so-called *Landmannschaften* (revanchist refugee organizations) in West Germany as well as by the Bonn Government suddenly became the slogan of the "reformers", the so-called progressive forces.

The elections to the shop committees which were carried out six months ago saw a campaign by the counter-revolutionaries under the slogan of: "Shop committees without communists!". Unfortunately this slogan was in part not without success. But where does it come from?

On July 1, 1963, the Social Democrat Wenzel Jaksch, leader of the revenge-seekers' organizations, sent a note of greetings to the so-called Sudeten Congress in Stuttgart, including the following passage:

"A communist domination of lasting nature in Bohemia will spell the downfall of the Czech people. It could continue existing as a language community, but its very soul would have been bolshevized. That is why we say to all those who talk about Europe: A peaceful Europe must also include a German Sudetenland".

Even more openly Hans-Christoph Seebohm, then a minister in the Bonn government and spokesman of the *Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft*, had told a press conference in Cologne in the summer of 1961: "We will return to our hereditary home. But it will be one without Czechs and Communists."

A home country without Communists, trade unions without Communists, a government without Communists, Czechoslovakia without Communists—they would have reached the goal of their imperialist ambitions.

Far-reaching aims

In the mouthpiece of the West German CDU, *Politisch-Soziale Korrespondenz* Ernst Majonica, chairman of the foreign policy commission of the CDU/CSU parliamentary group, wrote as follows:

"In foreign policy we have far-reaching aims. Reunification means a radical change of the relations of power that have developed after World War II."

These far-reaching aims which presuppose a changing of the relations of power—, mean: The West German imperialist know that in order to realize their plans they must charge the status quo. Only a few days before the solidarity action of the allied socialist countries, Federal Chancellor Kiesinger, in an exstasy of imminent success, was careless enough to utter this loudly. With this, West Germany's protestations that it "did not interfere" were reduced to absurdity.

For the Federal Republic hegemony is at stake. Franz Josef Strauss formulated these in his book *Entwurf für Europa* (Design for Europe):

"We should recall that Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania etc. belong to Europe as much as Switzerland, Holland or Belgium do. By exerting influence on these countries it must be ensured in a lengthy process, that these countries become a component part of Europe, for a start at least in the sense of an 'intermediate Europe'..."

The next aim is European federation. It will gradually be given sovereign national rights. The present nation-states would receive in the course of time a status similar to that of the *Länder* in the German federal state."

Here we have, as we see, an Europe without communists which is synonymous to a Greater Germany. Behind this we find not only the power policy of West German imperialism, but also economic interests.

Flick who is prospecting for Uranium in the Bavarian Forest, naturally wants to be in possession of the uranium mines on the other side of the border, in

Czechoslovakia. That same Flick has pinned his hopes also on the Czechoslovak automobile industry, which would then make him the greatest automobile producer in Europe (he would control then Daimler-Benz, Auto-Union, part of the Volkswagenwerke, part of BMW, Škoda, Tatra).

The AEG group has turned its mind to the old production centres of Děčín and Podmokly which it had exploited during the Second World War.

The IG-Farben group is eager to regain control over the north Bohemian chemical industry.

In order to raise these claims and to support them financially the monopolies have established several dummy organisations with which they financed the revenge-seeking groups and counter-revolutionary forces in the Č.S.S.R.

One of those organisations is the "Representative Society of Economic Enterprises Expelled from their Homeland" in Bonn, at No. 15 Poppelsdorfer Allee, an earlier Sudeten German entrepreneur, Max Richter, whose domicile is now in Marburg a. d. Lahn. A second organisation is the "South East European Society" (SOG). In its board of directors we find representatives of the IG-Farben group, the Deutsche Bank, the Dresdener Bank, the Commerzbank, the Bayerische Hypotheken- und Wechselbank and the Wandt group.

This organisation, for example, grants financial support to the Deutsche Welle radio station, which is directly instructed and directed the counter-revolutionaries, during the recent events in the Č.S.S.R.

III. The "Helping" Hands

The "Yalta" Hotel on Prague's Wenceslas Square often had illustrious guests. The most interesting long-term guests whom it has accommodated for something like a year are the members of the West German trade mission led by Dr Heipertz. If there is

to be trade between two countries, then there must be centres responsible for making transactions. This is clear. In the meantime things were happening in the suite on the second floor of the "Yalta" Hotel which from the very beginning, but to an increased extent since January, had little to do with trade in the classical sense of the world.

The cars parked in front of the hotel and the large number of guests allowed all sorts of conclusions to be drawn. The role that the strange mission of Dr Heipertz was playing became obvious, to be sure, on August 24, 1945, when West German broadcasting, linked up with the "free radios" of Czechoslovakia which were operated by anti-socialist forces, transmitted a so-called report on the situation by a Frau Dr Müller of the trade mission, which contained open counter-revolutionary instructions.

At that moment it became apparent what had been carried out under cover for months.

For a long time Heipertz had kept in close contact with the Czechoslovak economist Selucky who, for his part, was an intimate friend of Ota Šik. Thus not only the so-called economic reform programme of Mr. Selucky was "fructified" by Heipertz and embellished with West German promises of credits, but Heipertz was also acquainted with the most confidential affairs of the government.

Prominent Visitors

This induced Heipertz not only to make the usual reports to his superiors in Bonn, but also to propose that experts and politicians be sent to Prague, to whom he wanted to establish the necessary contact with the "appropriate quarters".

The most prominent and influential visitor was the President of the West German Federal Bank, Kaas-Blessing, at the beginning of July. This man, who at one time was among Himmler's circle of friends, formerly was commissioner-general of the German

branch of Unilever. But prior to the Second World War the Unilever trust had a considerable holding in Czechoslovak industrial undertakings. Unilever people from Great Britain were among the foreign policy advisers of the first Head of State of Czechoslovakia, President Masaryk, around whom an unprecedented prestige was established during the time of preparing for the counter-revolution.

One can see, therefore, that Herr Blessing is an interesting man who was certainly eager to take up old contacts and who at the same time, however, was authorized to present the head of the Czechoslovak Federal Bank with offers of credits under the appropriate conditions.

A second interesting visit was that of a delegation of Members of Parliament of the coalition government in Bonn. These MPs were Eppler (Social Democrat), Müller-Herrmann and Marx (CDU party). Here the suggestive fact should not be forgotten that one member of this delegation, namely Herr Werner Marx, had only a short time before stayed in Greece, which is ruled by a fascist military junta, where he felt that the dictatorship was not so bad after all and that democracy was being quite respectably attended to.

These experts, then, stayed for several days in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic where they established contacts both with official bodies and, in particular, with journalists of *Literární Listy*, *Svobodné slovo* and *Práce*. The upkeep of a close "exchange of experience" was dealt with and a delegation of journalists from Czechoslovakia were invited to visit the Federal Republic.

What would happen if ...?

In the meantime Heipertz independently took up contacts with radio and television journalists. There were several meetings with the head of Prague television, Jiří Pelikan, who was one of the leading brains

of the anti-socialist forces. In doing so measures were quite openly discussed for case X—what would happen if the counter-revolution was forced, no matter for what reason, to work illegally for a length of time. Heipertz promised help and the now well-known supply of transportable radio and television equipment units was made by AEG and Lorenz. Indeed, the broadcasting equipment was used for a time after 21st August, and in some cases on wavelengths which also could be switched over to by the *Deutsche Welle*, the *Deutschlandfunk* and *Radio Free Europe*, so that it was often not clear who was really broadcasting and from where this was being done.

Radio Free Europe, which played an insidious role in 1956 against Hungary, increased its direct transmissions in the Czech and Slovak languages—quite apart from the taking over of the "free broadcasting stations"—to 22 hours per day. More than 120 Czech and Slovak emigrés, mostly Tiso people (Josef Tiso was the head of the Slovak government that was dependent on Hitler from 1939 to 1944) worked the English Garden No. 1 in Munich in order to jingle up the counter-revolution.

The Bundeswehr (West German armed forces) moved its psychological warfare (PSK) battalions from Andernach, Ulm and Hammelburg up to the vicinity of the border and gave its support to the counter-revolutionary broadcasting campaign, as the western press has also had to admit in the meantime. At times there were so many "free broadcasting stations" on the frequencies that they had to tell each other to get the air so that they could get a word in.

Apart from the station *Radio Free Europe*, a centre of subversion maintained in West Germany by the U.S.A., the official West German government broadcasting stations *Deutschlandfunk* and the *Deutsche Welle* were the main ones which tried to direct influence events in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic by expanded programmes in the Czech and Slovak languages.

Just the Same as in Hungary

But most of the threads converged on the "Yalta" hotel where Heipertz was able to receive yet another prominent guest in the middle of July, who was undertaking a "private lecture tour": Walter Scheel, Chairman of the West German FDP party and former Minister for "development aid" in the Bonn Government. This trip by a leading FDP politician is reminiscent of the journey made by FDP Member of Parliament Hubertus Prinz von Löwenstein to Budapest in October 1956, who also helped to substantially influence the events from his hotel. The development aid which Scheel brought the counter-revolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia in 1968 consisted of lectures on the allegedly non-existent danger of West German fascism and revanchism, on "liberal policy", as well as the attempt to slander the GDR and to assert the necessity of its isolation.

Over the few days which followed, one could read and hear a great deal about this in the press, radio and television. "Freedom of the press" prevailed. However, it served, as Lenin formulated as long ago as 1921, not the working class, but the bourgeoisie. "We clearly see this fact," Lenin wrote at that time to G. Myasnikow, that "freedom of the press" means in practice that the international bourgeoisie will immediately buy up hundreds and thousands of Cadet, Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik writers, and will organize their propaganda and fight against us."

Suspicious Loans

But not only in the above-mentioned fields was there extensive agreement between West German politicians and the anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary forces. Even the *Landsmannschaften*, the most evil revanchist gangs, were welcomed for their intellectual and political aid. In July two Czechoslovak politicians surprised West German television viewers by remark-

ing that they could well imagine that Sudeten Germans would once again be able to return to Czechoslovakia. Where on earth did they get that?

On 2nd July 1968 the chief of the Sudeten German Becher, who was editor-in-chief of the Nazi newspaper *Landsmannschaft*, CSU Bundestag deputy Walter Die Zeit in the Sudeten region of that time and Konrad Henlein, stated at a revanchist rally in Stuttgart that:

"I know that it will sound audacious to many. Yet many Czechs and Slovaks agree with us when I say that the best form of economic aid for Czechoslovakia would be the reintegration of Sudeten German entrepreneurs and skilled workers, would be the reincorporation of Bohemian-Moravian Germanism in its old homeland."

The German-language *Volkszeitung* in Prague began at the same time to print readers' letters sent to the Sudeten German *Landsmannschaft*.

The "helping" hands were no longer to be overseen

The Waiters ...

Within the framework of this report it has not been possible to deal with the role played by the so-called clubs, which had come into existence under the management of anti-socialist forces, and in some cases fascist ones. They comprised one of the centres of the internal counter-revolution. As the *Spiegel* had recently admitted, it had been envisaged to bring out a newspaper in autumn which would be edited by former personnel of the Czechoslovakian Legion, who had taken part 50 years ago in the armed intervention against the young Soviet state.

Neither could the role of the clergy be dealt with which, as in Hungary in 1956, likewise fulfilled its "responsibilities". Archbishop Beran, who was at one time expelled from the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, had been waiting in West Germany since the be-

ginning of August after having left the Vatican. What for?

What were they all waiting for—in Munich and Bonn, in Cologne and West Berlin, in Washington and Vienna? They were waiting for the grand plot to succeed with which they once again threatened peace in Europe. They were waiting for the attack to start which they had defensively introduced against a socialist country, and to be carried off successfully. And they needed this success very badly after the many defeats of the past few years. This time they also did not hit it off.

... Were Disappointed

On 21st August 1968 it was clear, just as it was on 13th August 1961. And thus it came to pass that the *Flottgarter Zeitung* wrote on 23rd August 1968:

"The 21st August marks the end of a phase of post-war policy that began eight years ago ... (today) we have come to the end of the so-called policy of bridge-building."

We are gratified at this, even though it does not mean that we shall relax our vigilance. When one knows how great conspiracies and plots are organized and contrived, then one also knows that they will never cease as long as imperialism exists.

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin, September 4, 5 and 6, 1968)

Inwardly Ravenous Wolves

A reflection on the political function of the
"new communism"

By Dr Harald Wessel

To be sure, the expression of a wolf in sheep's clothing is quite old. Matthew even warned in the New Testament: "Guard against false prophets who come to you in sheep's clothing; for inwardly they are ravenous wolves." Accordingly, criminal intentions have since time immemorial been camouflaged in the gown of noble ideals and behind the mask of humanity. But only in our times has the wolf-in-sheep's-clothing demagoguery been brought to extensive perfection.

When Josef Goebbels began 35 years ago to manipulate the opinions of millions with the aid of monopolised press, toe-the-line films and the so-called utility radio sets ("Goebbels' harp"), the wolf-like demagoguery of the past was put in the shade: He presented the most fanatical haters of socialism, the most evil baiters of socialists and the most blood-murderers of socialists as being "national socialists".

Is Springer a Communist?

Yet Goebbels who perished like a wolf remains a bungler of demagoguery, a beginner in the game of political camouflage and a naive amateur pharisee in comparison to those opinion manipulators in Hamburg, Bonn and West Berlin who are today conducting

their brain-washing campaign. The discoverer of the "public utility radio" would turn white with envy if he could see the *Bild* newspaper and the "Black Channel" television programme in action. He would be filled with wonder if he could see how Kiesinger and Brandt, Springer and Ahlers, as well as the many smaller hacks were concerning themselves with the deepest sympathy for the welfare of socialism.

That is undoubtedly the greatest lie of modern times, namely the monstrous fact that those who are the declared mortal enemies of socialism, and who have proved it thousands of times, should presume to be its highest judges, that they pose as the guardians of the virtues of socialism, that they want to school the world as to what real socialism is, and that they act as though nothing were closer to their hearts than the attractiveness of socialism.

They are without doubt the greatest demagogues of our time: Heinrich Lübke, in whose concentration camps innumerable Communists lost their lives and who is now giving a few encouraging words to the "democratic Communists in Prague"; the Goebbels propagandist Kiesinger who puts up with those revanchists who would like to conquer a large part of Bohemia and Moravia, but who at the moment is acting as though he would gladly give the whole of Bavaria to a "democratic socialist Czechoslovakia"; the wretched Herr Brandt, who wailed to eliminate the teachings of Karl Marx from the Social Democratic Party programme, but who is now publicly proclaiming where Marxism is allegedly being implemented wrongly and where it is being implemented correctly; the opinion-maker Springer, who only a matter of weeks ago was agitating pogroms against West German students who embraced socialism, and whose paper have since the 21st August been shedding crocodile tears about the "terrible fate of true socialism in Czechoslovakia".

Hypocrisy Overdone

Yes, why does Brandt not arrange for the works of Marx to be printed *en masse*? Why does Lübke not immediately repeal the prohibition of the German Communist Party? Why does Kiesinger not straight away ban the West German neo-Nazi N.P. party and the gangs of revanchists? Why does Springer not disappropriate himself? Why do the West German television commentators not demand that the properties of the West German monopolies become public socialist property? Why do the gentlemen in Bonn and Schöneberg not begin to practise socialism when its attractiveness is allegedly their greatest concern?—One cannot believe one single word that comes from these types! One should not even believe some of the things that are partly true, because even these are subjected to an extremely demagogic concept and because, indeed, the malice of the wolf is quite evidently poking out of their sheep's skin.

When one thinks of the events that followed the 21st August 1968, then one cannot escape the impression that Bonn's hypocrisy of socialism has been overdone. One asks oneself how malevolent a wolf which needs so much sheep's clothing must be. One can see that the people in Bonn are most loathesomely hypocritical of all, because they are the most interested in the erosion of socialist power in Czechoslovakia, and because they kept the greatest hopes of conquest.

Aid from the Islanders

The hypocrisy of socialism guided by Bonn would have been very easy to see through if they had not been able to support their arguments with theories of "new", "modern" and "true" socialism and communism which have again come into fashion particularly strongly over the past few years. These theo-

ries are propagated by people who are reputed to be Marxist philosophers in various parts of the world.

Thus the French news agency AFP, for example, reported that a philosophy congress held to mark the 150th birthday of Karl Marx had come to an end on the Yugoslav island of Korcula with a call for a "new communism". "50 philosophers from twelve countries", among them "Yugoslav, French, Rumanian and German thinkers", had proposed "an anti-imperialist, anti-American doctrine free from Soviet and Chinese encumberment." Unfortunately, AFP did not report how this wonder ideology, neither meat nor fish, neither cold nor warm, neither red nor white, is supposed to look like. The philosophical islanders obviously did not quite know either.

What the "new communists" on the Dalmatian island were specifically thinking of was betrayed by the "German thinker", Iring Fetscher, a professional distorter of Marx, in a report in Hamburg's *Die Zeit* newspaper. Svetozar Stojanovic from Belgrade demonstrated in Korcula that the Soviet Union was not a socialist country, but an "absolutist state". Events in Czechoslovakia could "lead in the long run to a rejuvenation of communism". The modest "German thinker" Fetscher presented Herbert Marcuse and Ernst Bloch, who both attended the insular council, as being the intellectual forerunners of the "new communism".

A Vanguard of Youth?

Herbert Marcuse was celebrated in Korcula as a thinker "who controls the vanguard of progressive youth". Certainly in so far that Marcuse has equipped American and West German students with arguments against the war of aggression of the U.S.A. in Vietnam, and again the imperialist manipulation of opinion, he gained substantial influence over academic youth in imperialist countries. But other Marcusian

ideas have put the aging philosopher out of fashion among his supporters.

Marcuse's theory of spontaneity and his abhorrence of every form of discipline, authority and organisation, make him a poor adviser. For example, leading oppositional West Berlin students in the meantime have remarked that their struggle would fail without an organisation. Some of them turned away from Marcuse. And in Paris in May another Marcusean theory was practically refuted, namely the theory that the working class was no longer a springboard of revolution. Millions of French workers made it known that they are quite prepared to strike for political and economic interests and to fight in the streets.

The contradictory structure of thoughts of Herbert Marcuse, which is partly illusionary, and reduced to the "grand refusal" is consequently encumbered with so many burdens that one can hardly expect an adult person to accept it as the "new communism". On the contrary, the phenomenon of Marcuse shows that a "philosophy" that is anti-imperialist and at the same time anti-Soviet must inevitably suffer collapse, because it is intellectually and practically impossible.

A Hurried Joke

Now that "German thinker" sponsored by Bonn, Iring Fetscher, also paid tribute to Ernst Bloch as a "new communist". While Marcuse attacks the existing world of socialism from the left, as it were, Bloch is now applying—at the sunset of his life—for the position of a chief ideologist of West German Social Democracy, i.e. from the right. In May, Bloch held a speech in commemoration of Karl Marx in Trier, attended by Willi Brandt, which make it clear what we can expect from Bloch in "new communism": Political jokes.

Bloch advised the Social Democrats that it was wrong to throw Marx overboard. On the contrary, his teachings would have to be taken up and modernised.

Marx's theory on the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat, for example, would have to be modernised. Karl Marx had hurriedly worked these teachings out and had not completed them. In this context modern socialism meant the immediate dismantling of the power of the socialist state. In Korcula it was said, with reference to locality, "we avow ourselves to autonomous administration." While Bonn, then, is centralising its state monopoly power and mobilising for aggression internally and externally by means of its emergency decree constitution, we in the socialist countries threatened by revanchism should do away with the state as the organisation for our protection. This presumption is certainly no pious wish and no longer social utopianism, but only intelligible as a reactionary intention. Such a "new communism" would amount to the existing world of real socialism committing suicide.

Advisers of the Demagogues

Ernst Bloch's call for the political suicide of the socialist countries is, by the way, nothing new. The Austrian ideologist Ernst Fischer has been propagating similar theses for years. For this reason it is a wonder that he did not take part in the council of the islanders. There he could have once again told that the socialist state was "alienated" to the interests of the citizens, and that for this reason "absolute freedom of the press" and "political pluralism" were necessary to remove this "alienation". But Fischer at that time had something more important to do: He was giving Hamburg's *Spiegel* magazine instructions on terminology.

Ernst Fischer called on West German journalists to not, for Heaven's sake, talk of "a disintegration of communism", as some people might have said in the West, and also not of "creeping counter-revolution", as was being talked of in the East. One could only

interpret the development in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic as one of "reforming communism". To make it quite clear: Ernst Fischer gave the wolves in sheep's clothing suggestions as to how they could better camouflage themselves. Ernst Fischer disclosed in his blathering the objective political function of the slogans of the "new communism".

At the council of islanders there was, apart from Fischer, another "friend of wisdom" missing, a philosopher with practical experience in the "new communism": We mean Ivan Sviták. He has also for years been preaching "the elimination of alienation". But instead of helping in a concrete and constructive way to develop socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia, he systematically improve administrative work according to scientific principles, to enable the people to take part in government and to encourage them, thus strengthening socialist society, Sviták came out against the party and the state. He demanded the "free, spontaneous activity of the masses, who will no longer allow themselves to be directed by the party and the state apparatus." And Sviták did not stop at preaching: A few months ago he founded the "Club of Non-Party Activists" as the "nucleus of opposition outside of the National Front".

A Cry for Blood

The course of Ivan Sviták from being a preacher of the "new communism" to becoming the organiser of opposition against the party and the state, to becoming an out-and-out counter-revolutionary, makes it abundantly apparent in whose service the drive about the "new communism" is: The hypocrites and cold-war mongers, who would like to drown our developing new world in blood. In the meantime Sviták has found his way to the U.S.A. Previously he had called for armed struggle against sincere communists, against the leadership of the Communist Party of

Czechoslovakia and against the allied socialist countries. This is the macabre result of one who wanted to find a "new communism".

But we shall remain loyal to Marx, Engels and Lenin and to the decisions of our Party which have been scientifically-founded and confirmed in practice. We confront all the new development problems in our society and in international politics. Where Marx, Engels and Lenin can give us no direct answer, we try to find it in their spirit, and this we do collectively, constructively, critically, creatively, practically and without dogmatic trappings, but nevertheless with firm principles. Every day we apply scientific socialism anew. For this reason we do not need a "new communism", and least of all a "new communism" which serves the declared mortal enemies of our world, the traditional anti-communists, as camouflage for their demagoguery, as a mask of modernity and ipso facto as a delightful playground for wolf-like intentions.

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin, of 5th September 1968)

The Position of the Workers in the Class Struggle between Socialism and Imperialism

From the speech by Herbert Warnke, Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (S.E.D.) and Chairman of the National Executive of the Confederation of Free German Trade Unions (F.D.G.B.), at the XXVIII German Workers' Conference on September 7, 1960

This Workers' Conference has a special and great significance; for it gives representatives of workers and trade unionists from the two German States and West Berlin the opportunity at the right time of conferring on the position of the working class in a complicated situation of class struggle between socialism and imperialism, and of drawing the necessary conclusion for further struggle from this.

The True Intentions of the Imperialists

Let's call a spade a spade, as is usual among workers. What are they trying to kid the workers all day in and day out, in West Germany? They are really expected to believe that it was simply and purely a question in Czechoslovakia of correcting the mistakes of the past, and that we wanted to prevent this. But these are infamous lies. The Communist and Workers' parties and the governments of the Soviet Union, the G.D.R., the People's Republic of Bulgaria, People's Poland and the Hungarian People's Republic have unequivocally declared that it was necessary in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to correct mistakes and weaknesses, to strengthen the socialist state power, to extend socialist democracy and to further develop the economy in the interests of increasing the living standard of the working people. But the imperialists

were not concerned with this, with the strengthening of socialism in Czechoslovakia. They were concerned with something quite different:

From the abundance of evidence exposing the true intentions of imperialism, I would like to mention the following here:

Like Hitler in his book *Mein Kampf* (My Struggle), the Chairman of the West German Christian Social Union Party and strong-man in Bonn, Franz Josef Strauss, laid down the strategic conception of West German imperialism for penetrating the socialist countries of Europe in his book *Entwurf für Europa* (Design for Europe). To cite Strauss, for him it was a question of a capitalist Europe which "stretches from the Atlantic to the River Bug and to the Black Sea."

But more. Herr Strauss is not exactly reserved in the presentation of his real plans. With a considerable amount of frankness he wrote in the English edition of his book (entitled *The Grand Design*—ed.) that the best method "of rapprochement" was that of "softening up and breaking open the communist empire from inside." And a final quote from the same book. Strauss wrote that Bonn's policy would have to be directed at promoting "a development recognizable in its very beginning" in some east European countries and "of bringing it to the point of no return." So much for this quote.

The purpose of the deliberations of Čierna, of Bratislava, and of the helpful military action taken by the allied socialist states on 21st August, and also of the consultations between representatives of the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia in Moscow, was precisely to prevent the aim Herr Strauss was striving for from being realised.

Do the statements of Franz Josef Strauss, which I have mentioned, only relate to his private opinion? Is it just a question of a number of especially aggressive tirades by an individual? No, it is a question of the official policy of West German imperialism and its government under Kiesinger, Strauss and Brandt.

Can one therefore envisage the events in Czechoslovakia in isolation from the great class struggle that is taking place in Europe and on a world-wide scale? No, for whoever does that is not looking behind the scenes and does not get to the crux of the matter.

This is the crux of the matter: The power of the socialist states and their political, economic and military strength make it currently seem advisable even to the most aggressive sections of the West German monopoly bourgeoisie not to burn their fingers in a military frontal attack against the German Democratic Republic and the other socialist states. But this has not made them give up their aim, the expansion of monopoly rule. They have merely changed their tactics and believed (with a nuclear-armed Bundeswehr in the background) that they could penetrate the socialist countries with their "new eastern policy" and with slogans of "liberalisation" and "democratic socialism", that they could divide these countries and break one country after another away from the socialist community.

The Basic Truth of Our Times

We shall never go wrong in our assessment of the situation and shall always find the correct point of view when we proceed from the basic truth of our times: We are living in an epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. In Europe and in Germany today the two great class forces, socialism and imperialism, confront each other in embittered struggle.

We know that many workers and champions of peace in West Germany find it difficult to see through the campaign of slander, falsification and anti-communist hatred, which has once again reached a climax, and to distinguish between truth and lies.

As always in times of hard class struggle, those people were and are well-advised who keep to the golden rule left to us by August Bebel: When my enemies praise me, then I have done something wrong.

If we measure the events of the past few weeks and months with this one, but sure, yardstick, then it should be clear to every worker and socialist:

Up until 20th August the gentlemen in Bonn were rejoicing at developments in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The situation was a bad one, then, for the socialist order in this country, and for European peace. Indeed, day by day the anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary forces outside and inside Czechoslovakia became more impudent and active. In Czechoslovakia they were already taking part in the exercise of power, were represented by a number of ministers, already controlled television, radio and the press, brought more and more people into confusion, and orientated an especially large section of youth on the road to counter-revolution. They hoped within a short time to take over complete power.

I should like to recall some words of Klement Gottwald, the first President of socialist Czechoslovakia, who is known and highly respected by us all. It was at the Congress of Shop Committees on 22nd February 1948 in Prague when he declared that reactionary forces were attempting "to destroy the people's democracy and to restore capitalism and a Munich situation. Indeed, the present mischief-makers are trying to return to the year 1920, to form an anti-popular government and to destroy step by step the achievements of our revolution and of our post-war construction effort. This would in the long run have meant once again handing over the nationalised factories to the capitalists."

And I should like to quote still something else from this important speech. At that time, 20 years ago, Klement Gottwald stated, "Our own reaction does not stop at anything. To obtain the assistance of foreign reaction it is even prepared to tear apart our alliance with the Soviet Union and the other... states, to allow the resurgence of German imperialism and even to take part in a new Munich in the name of their class interests."

That was said 20 years ago. But obviously many have forgotten it. Instead of continually strengthening the power of socialism, instead of developing socialist consciousness on this basis and of countering imperialist ideology, the gate was opened wider and wider to hostile ideology in Czechoslovakia. Finally, the mass media (press, radio and television) were led to fall prey, indeed surrendered, to those very forces against which Klement Gottwald had warned as long as 20 years ago. Thus the great achievements of the Czechoslovakian working class in the construction of socialism were placed in the greatest danger.

Here is the decisive reason why the imperialist forces temporarily succeeded in gaining influence and positions in Czechoslovakia. The politicians in Bonn rejoiced over this until 20th August. But since the 21st August they have wailed, raged and agitated. But even these reactions of theirs prove that the fraternal socialist countries have acted in the right way; the cause of peace and socialism has won a class battle.

A chief witness from the camp of the inveterate 20th-century crusaders is the Baron von und zu Guttenberg. Not long ago a reporter asked him on West German television whether the 21st August 1968 had brought about a change in the constellation of forces. The Baron answered: "Yes, but to our disadvantage."

The Foundations of Peace

Of course, many people now ask the question: How are things to continue in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic? There is only one way: The restoration and strengthening of workers' power, the socialist state power, the destruction of the counter-revolution in all its forms. Precisely that is the substance of the joint arrangements reached in Čierna and Bratislava, and to just the same extent of that agreed on in

Moscow. The Springer press people are shouting so loudly because the times of 1938 and 1939 have now past.

How is it that we have now had peace for 23 years? What is the reason for Europe and the peoples of this continent having lived through the longest period of peace in this century?

If Europe has already lived in peace for 23 years and the possibility exists that peace and security might be guaranteed for a longer period, then it is only because the constellation of forces has been changed to the advantage of peace, in favour of the vital interests of the peoples, and to the benefit of social progress through the power and growth of the Soviet Union and of the socialist states. European peace has a decisive foundation in the strength of socialism, and in the firmness and advance of the socialist states.

Who Makes Millions from the Arms Business?

One cannot fail to arrive at this truth when one asks the old question which presents itself time and time again: To whom does the power in the state belong, which class interests underlie the policy of the state, who wins and who loses?

Is there even one single person in a socialist order of society who could personally benefit by the carrying out of a policy of expansion, of a war of conquest and, accordingly, of armament for aggressive intentions? Even the most embittered enemies and most evil slanderers of socialism do not dare to maintain that.

But in West Germany it is profitable and brings in enormous wealth to pursue the arms business and to plan and carry out a policy which keeps the arms business in gear and continuously steps it up. It is indeed no coincidence that such decisive giant undertakings as the successors to IG-Farben, the Flick

trust, Klöckner and Haniel, the Quandt group, and the aircraft industry under Bölkow, Messerschmitt and Dornier obstinately refuse to reveal their accounts to the public, although this has so often been demanded by trade unionists.

Why do such giant undertakings in particular feel the need to throw light on their takings? Because they do not want to admit the thousands and thousands of millions that they have wrung out of the arms business. Because they are the ones who for reasons of profit and the expansion of their markets and spheres of power prevent a policy of real relaxation and disarmament and, instead of this, pursue a policy of expansion, revanchism and hegemony in Europe through the ministers in Bonn who are subservient to them.

I should like to present just one example here. In July this year the Federal Executive of West German industry published its annual report for 1967/68, a report which is naturally destined for internal purposes and is not placed before any trade unionists. This stated: "West German industry expects that it will be engaged more strongly than before in disarmament responsibilities."

So it is with every aspect of Bonn's policy. Just take the treaty to ban the spread of nuclear weapons, the signing of which by West Germany is long overdue and which is urgently necessary in the interests of West Germans. If it has to this hour not been signed and there is no intention of signing it, then standing in the background are the profit and power interests of the arms industry, which has direct influence on the decisions of the Kiesinger-Strauss-Brandt government through its representatives in the so-called Atomic Commission.

We have 23 years of peace behind us and we all wish that further years of peace, of secure peace, may follow. But whoever wishes to really realize this, as opposed to romantic dreams, must help to secure the stable foundation of peace and further extend it.

He must—especially if he is a worker—help to thwart all imperialist attacks on the socialist camp, and all counter-revolutionary endeavours, no matter in what camouflage they may appear. For socialism and peace are as closely related as, on the other hand, imperialism and war are. If peace is to triumph in Europe, then socialism must be strong and invincible. The stronger that the power of the socialist states is, the smaller are the chances for imperialist adventures in the sense of the European conception of Herr Franz Josef Strauss and his allies in the U.S. Pentagon.

What is Democracy?

I should now like to turn to a theme which we especially well know in the G.D.R. on the basis of our own experience and—I can say without exaggeration—which we master perfectly. I mean the theme of democracy.

We do not need to adopt an attitude to the question of democracy on the basis of abstract formulas or theoretical considerations, but we can do this through the example of the life of the working people in town and country. Let's have a look, then, at democracy in the G.D.R., where it has its material foundation:

Democracy, in other words the rule of the people, is marked by the fact that the majority of the people, that is in particular the working class, exercises political power. Exactly this has been realized in the German Democratic Republic. But exactly this has to this very day not been fulfilled in West Germany.

Democracy—that is the realization of the old trade union demand "what the hands of the people create, should be the people's own." In the G.D.R. the people's ownership of the means of production, of all natural wealth, and of material riches has been realized and anchored in the Constitution. People's

ownership is the material basis of the exercise of the basic rights of the working people in the economy in the state and in politics.

Democracy rules when the daughters and sons of workers, employees, peasants and craftsmen are given the opportunity, in accordance with their abilities and talents, to learn everything in order to be able to become everything. Who would dare to doubt that precisely this is one of the greatest achievements of the socialist G.D.R.? Whoever would dare to doubt, on the other hand, that precisely the medieval conditions in West German education condemn young people in the Federal Republic to intellectual servitude and are a typical characteristic of the backwardness and obsolescence of West Germany society?

Democracy rules only when women and men have full equal rights in all fields of politics and of social life and when the centuries-old discrimination and oppression of women, who today comprise the majority of the population in both German states, is overcome. Precisely this is a further truly historical achievement of the German Democratic Republic. Precisely this is, as it has always been, an unfulfilled demand for West Germany.

Democracy rules when the means of communication—the press, radio and television—are firmly in the hands of the working class.

Democracy rules when the scientific and technological revolution, which is in full swing, exercises an incisive influence on the lives of all strata of the population, and is implemented, not against, but for the working people under the leadership of the working class, and when structural changes in the economy are solved through socialist planning in close connection with the self-responsibility of the producers and under the direct participation of the workers, employees and scientists.

These principles underlie the economic policy of our G.D.R. The role of the trade union is growing

continually. The rights of the workers in this process are constitutionally guaranteed. Everyone can convince himself of this. And what is the situation in West Germany? One only needs to open the trade union papers or examine the situation of workers and employees on the Rhine and in the Ruhr and in the Saar districts to know that monopoly capital is also the great obstacle here to getting to grips with the problems of our times in a democratic way and solving these to the benefit of the people.

Whoever is even now prepared to utter nonsense about the need to first and foremost link socialism and democracy in some mysterious way, one must answer: My dear Sir, at best you know nothing of socialism, then it would be better if you kept quiet. Or you are malevolent, you are a slanderer and enemy of socialism. Then we declare relentless war on you!"

Advice to the Advisers in the West

For what do those people mean who today so loudly and frontally speak of introducing democracy to socialism? They want nothing else than to bring bourgeois democracy—the power of capital, which camouflages itself simply by parliamentary democracy and by a few verbal battles in parliament—, which is historically doomed and directed against the working class, into the socialist countries. But this means nothing else than to liquidate socialism, the power of the workers and peasants, and to turn back the clock to the outlived reactionary rule of capital. But this will never occur! In this, capitalism, as far as the G.D.R. and the other socialist countries are concerned, has reckoned without its host!

Whoever, then, in Bonn has discovered his heart for socialism and wishes to improve it, our socialism, he can find a broad field of activity in his own country. One could start by lifting the ban on the

Communist Party, for the West German Communists know very well what socialism is!

And whoever recommends "autonomy" in the economy to us, but himself furthers the concentration of capital and economic power in hitherto unknown dimensions, he can begin at home and first of all implement the most elementary democratic demands of the trade unions for qualified co-determination in large undertakings.

Whoever advises us on the freedom of the press—let me mention another example—can begin in West Germany with two elementary tasks: Firstly, with the readmission of the press of the Communist Party and of the other democratic organisations, and secondly, with the immediate disappropriation of the Springer trust, for example, which is agitating to the extent of a war.

And finally, whoever so loudly speaks of "democratic socialism", as the Social Democratic ministers in Bonn do, we recommend him to start with democracy in West Germany and to repeal the Emergency Laws. This would at least be a step forward, quite apart from socialism, which is not yet on the agenda in West Germany, but for which, one day we are sure, the working-class in the Federal Republic will start to struggle.

The advisers in the West are dangerously skating on ice. For these are none other than the questions which West German trade unionists find pressing. Is it not necessary to implement co-determination? Is it not necessary to bring about a radical reform of the education system? Is it not necessary to conduct a struggle especially to ensure that the Federal Republic signs the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, to recognise European frontiers and to put itself on the ground of reality with regard to the relations between the two German States—while fully annulling its claim to represent the whole of Germany? Those are indeed the questions of key importance in West Germany.

Mastering All Problems While Advancing

In this we do not say that the road we have taken in the G.D.R. has been easy or without difficulties, nor is the road ahead of us. Whoever has to fulfil such a great historic task as the victory of socialism on German soil, he is confronted with tasks which are completely new for the working-class, and here only one thing can be of assistance: To learn and learn again, to look far into the future and from this view to get to grips properly with today. Thus we have always in time recognized the newly appearing political, social and economic problems, have immediately analysed them and set about them without delay. We have always asked the people for advice before we made decisions. We have always told the truth, even on difficult problems and complicated phases of our development. But we have overcome difficulties just as firmly while advancing and in doing so have always strengthened the power of the people and have never gambled with it.

And here I must mention the name of that Comrade who has been elected to the highest position of the whole collective of our party, the name of the First Secretary of our party and Chairman of the Council of State of the G.D.R., Comrade Walter Ulbricht. May the agitators of the big bourgeoisie and of militarism tear their gobs out in their drivelling hatred against the first citizen of the first socialist state of German nation! Let's turn around the motto of August Bebel; then this reads just as truthfully and correctly: When your enemies pour hatred against you—then you are on the right road in the interests of the working people! And to have always recognized and pointed out this correct road, that is the great undying service of our Comrade Walter Ulbricht.

And here it would also be appropriate to say a clarifying word on who is today progressive and who is conservative. It is conservative to worship capitalism. It is conservative to glorify the

bourgeois fake democracy, with which the lack of freedom of the people is camouflaged. It is conservative to subordinate oneself to the ideology of imperialism and the uncultured nature of late capitalism. The distrust of the strength of the working class is conservative. It is conservative to surrender the position of power of the working class to the forces of big capital, which are camouflaging themselves as they have always done, and it is conservative to worship the big capitalist economy, which is founded on crisis and on the exploitation of the working class!

And who is progressive? He is progressive who courageously and resolutely takes sides with the anti-imperialist struggle without going astray. He who equips himself with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, who struggles against the omnipotence of monopoly capital in the capitalist countries, and who in the socialist countries deploys all his energies and creativity for the victory of socialism, for the strengthening of the power of workers and peasants, for true humanism and for true humanitarianism, is progressive.

To Recall the Power of the Class

Just one special word to the Social Democratic Comrades. I think it is high time to speak of some problems in all frankness. Where is their party going through the alliance between Social Democratic ministers and Kiesinger, Strauss, Hassel and Schröder? Is not the truth apparent today of our warning that Social Democratic ministers were only accepted by the monopoly bourgeoisie in the government in order to help the C.D.U. out of its political crisis and to put Bonn's revanchist policy into action with Social Democratic embellishment as the "new eastern policy".

Have the Social Democratic workers and trade unionists gained anything from this? On the contrary,

the N.P.—or neo-Nazism—has gained by the Bonn coalition. The Social-Democratic Party has been dragged into a crisis, and things can only get worse for them if the West German Social Democratic leaders—as is already perfectly clear—obstinately continue their policy of alliance with the C.D.U./C.S.U. The parties and the members, do not prevent them from doing so.

May they remember the strength of their class! May they remember that there is an invincible, socialist Soviet Union and always keep in mind that there is a workers' and peasants' state on German soil, whose strength and influence is increasingly growing! May they remember that the largest part of Europe is socialist and will remain socialist, and that the future belongs to socialism!

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin, September 10, 1968)

The Intellectual Vanguard of the Counter-Revolution

by Kurt Zimmermann

How was it possible that the counter-revolution was able to develop in a socialist country to such an extent as it happened in the C.S.S.R.? Who or who did the preparatory work? What were the decisive methods and weapons? The most important means used in that struggle corresponded to the strategic aim of imperialism to undermine the socialist order in the C.S.S.R. step-by-step and to shake the foundations of the whole socialist camp.

The main spadework was done by ideological subversion, revision of the basic positions of Marxism-Leninism and the mass dissemination of petty bourgeois, chauvinist, anti-soviet and anti-communist ideologies, a process which had started a long time before January 1968.

The organisational centre in the C.S.S.R., the spiritual vanguard of the counter-revolution, was a group of intellectuals, writers, artists, economists, philosophers, sociologists and others who were, in the first place, closely connected with the imperialist and social-democratic ideologists of West Germany as well as with revisionists in other countries.

As the main means served the mass media such as film, television, radio and the press which were gradually conquered and eventually completely dominated by the mentioned group. The mass media proved to be instruments of power of the first order.

With their help the flood of petty-bourgeois and chauvinist ideologies was created, directed and spread, and in this way it became possible to exert practical influence on the decisions of party and state leadership.

The Role of the Kafka-Conference

The paving of the ideological and theoretical way for the counter-revolution in the C.S.S.R. has its history. In connexion with the massive attacks by imperialism and revisionist elements against the Soviet Union, the socialist world system and the communist movement in the second half of the twentieth century, an increasing number of views were put forward in the C.S.S.R. which, though sailing under the slogan of fight against dogmatism and the bogey of "Stalinism", were in fact directed against the socialist order, the party of the working class and the basic positions of Marxism-Leninism.

One of the most significant milestones for the growing influence of revisionist and bourgeois ideologies was the so-called Kafka-Conference in May 1963 where revisionism came into the open in a massive form for the first time in the C.S.S.R. At first, the seemingly abstract problem of alienation was pushed into the foreground. In contradiction to the Marxist view that alienation results from the very nature of capitalist exploitation and that it is, step by step, eliminated as a result of the establishment of the political power of the working class and the development of man within socialist democracy, Messrs. Fischer, Goldstuecker & Co put forward the thesis that alienation was an equally characteristic phenomenon both in capitalism and socialism.

The attack against the Marxist-Leninist alienation theory was no mere coincidence. As was demonstrated at the Kafka-Conference and even more so in the following years mainly by Ernst Fischer, the aliena-

tion-theory, which was expounded there by Goldstuecker and others, was an ideal weapon for the allround defamation of socialism.

Successes of the G.D.R. Slandered

It is well known that comrades from the G.D.R. stood up consistently against such theories, both before and after this conference, and that based on the positive experience and the growing successes in the progressing consolidation of the unity between party and people, between citizen and state in the G.D.R. This induced revisionist forces inside and outside the C.S.S.R. to start a campaign of slander against our comrades and against the G.D.R. in general.

Further developments made crystal-clear what was concealed behind the discussions, which seemed then to be of an abstract-theoretical nature. They were supposed to help in constructing an unbridgeable antagonism between society and the socialist state, between working class and party, between individual interests and the socialist system. As has since emerged, from that thesis of alienation in socialism the conclusion was deduced that writers, artists and scientists ought to be, above all, critics and not defenders of socialism.

In connexion with the theories put forward at the Kafka-Conference, there developed in the C.S.S.R. a series of centres of bourgeois, petty-bourgeois and revisionist ideologists who launched ever more open and determined attacks against the socialist state and social order and the leading party of the working class, denigrated their actions, dragging through the mud every achievement of socialism.

As early as in 1963, Fischer and other revisionist theoreticians made an attempt to make Prague the stronghold of "modern Marxism". For this purpose they made every effort to "dissolve" the uniform Marxist ideology and to "open up" Marxism for

bourgeois theories. Particularly the thesis of "pluralism in Marxism" was proclaimed by Czech and Slovak theoreticians on various occasions, such as at international philosophical conferences in Opatija (December 1967) and in Varna (June 1968) as well as in periodicals and newspapers.

Stronghold of "Modern Marxism"

What is the objective of this thesis? It meant, in the first place, an attack against the unity and cohesion of the scientific and revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism and thereby also an attack against the unshakable ideological basis on which the community of the socialist countries and the unity of the communist movement are built. The pluralistic theory tried to blur the basic class frontiers and the politico-ideological schism between Marxism-Leninism on the one hand and a hotchpotch of revisionist, social-democratic and Trotzkyite theories on the other hand while the latter were activated for ideological diversion. And finally, this thesis served to launch attacks against Leninism as Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and the transition to socialism.

Attack against the Party

Proceeding from the theory of pluralism, revisionist forces dealt even at official conferences, with Marxism-Leninism as just one social theory among others with a view to throwing overboard its class character as the ideology of the working class. Revisionists took a stand against Leninism as a "monopoly interpretation of Marxism". They alleged that Lenin had merely accepted the theory and method of Marx and "confronted" it with the prevailing situation in Russia, and that there was a vast difference between conditions

in Czechoslovakia from those in Russia of that time. The bourgeois theory of pluralism served, in the final analysis, also to provide an ideological basis for the formation of factions within the party, which was tantamount with trying to abolish the CPCZ as a Marxist-Leninist party.

In keeping with this thesis, the fundamental principles of socialist construction, developed by Marx, Engels and Lenin, and the experiences made by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have been questioned in recent years and particularly so since January 1968. There was need for "courage and strength to stage a consistent confrontation with the old pattern of socialism and its standard-bearers", we read in a lengthy article which was published in *Rudé Právo* on July 10, 11 and 12, 1968.

The discussion on a socialism with a "new look" was mainly aimed against the Soviet Union and the CPSU. Contradictions and shortcomings during the transitional period were magnified beyond recognition, and the Soviet Union was in fact blamed for everything.

Suicidal Theory

What was the "model" of socialism like which the authors presented? Marxism-Leninism proceeds, in consonance with practical experiences, from the concept that in the process of socialist construction the party and the state organs must acquire and continually perfect the ability of scientific guidance of economy and society. In a "new look" or "national socialism", everything was to be changed. Now it is necessary, so they say, for socialist society to "limit and abolish, step by step, its organs of political power to prevent them from turning against socialist development and to make them cease their interference in spheres for which they are not competent (economics, science, culture, party life etc.)."

Also the party should "undergo a far-reaching renaissance" and "change its traditional form". This change was to consist in abandoning the principle of democratic centralism, and also in admitting factions which had been formed, that means, in relinquishing the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles of the party. Obviously, this is no model of socialism, but the revisionist theoretical platform leading to the suicide of socialism and the party.

The anti-socialist and anti-soviet hysteria brought to the surface a savage bourgeois nationalism. Shortly before the Meeting of Cierna, the C.S.S.R. Journalists' Centre demanded of the Presidium of the CC of CPCZ in a provocative fashion to "return to socialism its Czechoslovak face". The revisionist and counter-revolutionary forces advocated a special European mission of the C.S.S.R., which means that they tried to link up with the aggressive imperialist "European ideology". In April 1968, Mr. Snejdarek stated in Frankfurt on Main (West Germany): "Europe is and will remain the greatest fatherland of all of us." Thereby the bridge was built, not for an understanding between all anti-imperialist forces, but to the platform of Franz Josef Strauss with his "Grand Design".

Humanism Falsified

The focal philosophical problem, by virtue of which the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and the infiltration by bourgeois ideologies took place, was the issue of mankind and humanism. Marxism-Leninism has provided the practical and theoretical proof that genuine democracy, humanism and the free development of the individual can be realised only where the political and economic power is transferred from the hands of monopoly capital into those of the working class, where exploitation of man by man is abolished and where man but not profit is regarded as the measure

of all things. But precisely this Marxist theory, which poses and answers all the questions of humanism and man from a concrete-historical, viz. from the class point of view, was jettisoned and replaced by reactionary fashionable trends of contemporary bourgeois philosophy, abstract phrases on mankind, humanism and freedom, beyond the pale of time space and social system.

Thus a special variant of "bridge-building" was practised which was all the more dangerous as it was camouflaged to look like the restoration of "original aspirations of Marxist philosophy". Escalation mainly marched across this revisionist bridge by aid of reactionary bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologies and by assistance of the various revisionist groups and renegades of Europe which had selected Prague as their headquarters.

Prepared Long in Advance

The comprehensive, well-organised ideological-theoretical preparation of long standing was described quite candidly by Ernst Fischer on West German television as early as last March: "Everything was well prepared. The bust-up at the Writers' Conference has years of pre-history. Preliminary discussions, studies and circles, such as the study circle of prominent economist Ota Šik, sociological study circles of the Academy and in the Party School, various experiments in the field of literature and philosophy, contacts between intellectuals, writers and experienced party organisers, to ensure that everything takes a different, a better organised and planned course than had been the case in Hungary."

In this way it has been possible in recent years, especially after January 1968, to disintegrate the intellectual life of society in Czechoslovakia, to paralyse the party and the socialist state and to pave the way for the counter-revolution.

It is no mere coincidence that the imperialist press of West Germany stresses the leading role of a few intellectuals in the creeping counter-revolution who had been systematically building up their positions for a long time and had gradually become the "brain-trust" of the anti-socialist forces. This "brain-trust" did, at the same time, everything in its power to get the mass media into their grip and thus to carry bourgeois, petty-bourgeois and anti-socialist ideologies into the broad masses. Goldstuecker, one of those mainly responsible, declared in June this year in Vienna: "Our revolution was not only a revolution of the writers, but a revolution of the mass media." How did this development take place?

Scepticism on Celluloid

In the field of films the first steps towards "liberalization" made themselves felt as early as in the mid-fifties. Old and new film-workers looked for "contacts and approachment to the development in films in the modern world", as was stated by a West German newspaper. This new approach led to a completely one-sided orientation of the film industry on the capitalist countries and adapted itself increasingly to the demands of the capitalist film agencies. Works were created whose most outstanding features were scepticism in every aspect and conflicts between the individual and society.

This situation became particularly blatant in the early sixties, when imperialism started to test new methods of politico-ideological diversion against the socialist countries in the political world arena. In the so-called "new vogue" of Czechoslovak film, those strips predominate which question all socialist achievements and human values and depict man as a lonely being which is being helplessly tossed about by society, the state and the party. Their characteristic feature is the lack of any kind of ideological standards.

Unpalatable Fruits

The supposed unpolitical character of the leading figures has a deep political significance. The hero committed to socialism is replaced by a hero who is the object of manipulation by extraneous powers. Without any social background, the story is concentrated on the humdrum and most insignificant occurrences in his daily life the very existence of which is flat and desolate, helpless and hopeless and eventually founders in the ocean of despair. In these films one senses a complete loss of free will, initiative and activity.

Together with the outstanding works of literature of recent years, these films are the spiritual pacesetters from an absolute negation of all humanist traits of socialist society. Its aim is to be "oriented in the chaos of the epoch" (how well acquainted this terminology is with the arsenal of psychological warfare!). That means the theories developed at the Kafka-Conference bore their unpalatable fruits. Several writers wrote the script for these films, so that both in literature and film the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology have been able to gain a foothold and increasingly to determine work in these fields. Already in the early sixties that group succeeded in taking root in the spheres of television and radio and to get hold of a few newspapers and magazines which played an important role in spreading their petty-bourgeois views.

Close Links with Bonn

The fact that the counter-revolutionary "brain trust" concentrated its strength on dominating the mass media, was no coincidence. In our days, television, radio and the press have established themselves as decisive instruments in the hands of the socialist state in order to exercise the political power of the

working class, to systematically develop socialist consciousness among all sections of the population and to wage a relentless struggle against imperialist and revisionist ideologies. By systematically getting hold of the mass media the revisionist, counter-revolutionary forces, the first decisive practical step had been taken towards changing the political power relations in the C.S.S.R. and the gradual dismantling of all socialist achievements.

The Prague Writers' Congress, held in summer 1967, openly expressed, for the first time, the whole range of reactionary political demands of part of the intelligentsia. Mr. Vaculik, the author of the ill-famed "2,000 Words", Messrs. Klima, Kohout, Havel and others were not satisfied with launching theoretical attacks against socialist realism, but slandered the party, the state and socialism in a nasty way. Although the intellectual counter-revolution was already exerting its influence in literary and other journals, it was, at that time, still possible for sound forces to publish their views in the press without hindrance. At that time, the power of the counter-revolution had not yet reached a stage where anyone, who did not share their views, could be slandered as a conservative or collaborator. Yet, whither the road was leading, was no longer left in doubt.

The forces within the Writers' Union who had been removed from the leading positions in autumn 1967 on account of their reactionary attitude, but were re-instated in their previous functions early in 1968, began to display a lively activity and gradually to get the mass-media of radio, television and the press completely into their grip. As early as in February they directed, together with their new President Goldstuecker, political demands to the Central Committee of the CPCZ and opened up a blatantly counter-revolutionary discussion in their newly-founded weekly *Literarni Listy*. Their primary objective was, as Mr. Kohout put it in a TV-discussion with West German writer Guenter Grass, the conquest of press,

radio and television in order to obtain complete hegemony over the minds of the broad masses. At the same time, Mr. Prochazka, Vice-President of the Writers' Union, established close links with the West German mass media which placed their stations, newspapers and printing houses most generously in the service of the Writers' Union.

Manipulation and Coercion

The criticism levelled against shortcomings and mistakes of the party and state leadership, originally exercised by the counter-revolutionary forces very quickly developed into an open attack on the leading role of the party and demands for its complete liquidation. In their press, by means of radio and television, they offered vigorous resistance to every measure taken by the party and the state which was opposed to the interests of these counter-revolutionary elements. *Literarny Listy* posed as the "conscience of the nation" with the confirmation of the U.S.A. In lots of pamphlets the public were incessantly egged on to criticise and slander anything that looked even remotely like a defence of the socialist achievements. Every step taken by the Central Committee or the government was being watched, commented, approved, if it suited their purpose, or slandered if it stood in the way of their further objectives. Even the danger, intimated by the CC, that the initiated changes might be exploited for anti-socialist purposes, were used by them in their reckless hate-campaign. All leading bodies were subjected to incessant pressure by the counter-revolutionary forces in charge of the mass media through their incitement of public opinion.

The primarily adopted method of demands very soon developed into threats which informed any "wavering comrades" that they were being watched as to their attitudes and would be judged accordingly.

A call to assassinate leading comrades was the immediate consequence of that drive. *Literarny Listy* and the weekly students' magazine formed the intellectual centre of the counter-revolution by laying down the ideological marchroute for radio and television. The impact of that "brain trust" spread from day to day, conquering not only the publications of the intelligentsia, but even the dailies of mass organisations such as *Prace* (trade unions) and *Mlada Fronta* (Youth League).

Pressure on Party and State

The "brain trust", however, determined by its domination of the mass media, not only the ideological sphere, but also exerted influence on the policy pursued by the party and the government. Even appointments to leading positions in party and state organs were enforced under pressure by the mass media.

As one of the intellectual inspirers of the counter-revolution stated, the idea spread far and wide by the mass media, gripped the "broad masses of the people who, in their longing for freedom, overrolled and eventually forced the party machine to follow the masses and their political determination." Or, to put it differently: It was neither the party nor the socialist state, but that group of anti-socialist forces, which determined through the mass media, already to a great extent, the policy of Czechoslovakia. This group in fact forced party and government to adapt themselves to the moods it created. Not on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, but of these chauvinistic trends was the unity of the nation to be achieved, an extremely shaky ground indeed, as past experiences have proved to the hilt.

The attempt undertaken by the intellectual vanguard of the counter-revolution to undermine the socialist system in the C.S.S.R. by dominating the decisive

mass media, developed, from its very start, in conformity with the policy of the ruling circles particularly in the U.S.A. and in West Germany. Its basic traits were identical with the objectives of imperialist global strategy and its European-West German variant, the "new Eastern policy". Both of them aim at drawing the socialist countries through a gradual "Greater European loosening-up process" and "cultural and economic links more closely towards Western Europe" and thereby at creating conditions for a change in the social structure of the socialist countries.

"Ideas" were smuggled in

As early as in November 1962, *Aussenpolitik*, a West German periodical, had elaborated detailed political directions on the ideological struggle waged by the imperialists against socialist countries: "Our ideas must penetrate, by any means of modern propaganda and in a psychologically clever manner the public life of the communist states. The people in the communist states will thus become conscious or unconscious carriers of Western ideas, and a feeling of general uneasiness will be created which is the prerequisite for a non-violent internal change and revolution in those states. Here in Europe decisive conditions exist for enabling the West to carry out successful psychological warfare."

In consonance with the schemes of U.S. monopoly capital and the "European concept" devised by Franz Josef Strauss, it was, in the first place, institutions of West German imperialism which were allotted the task to use cunningly-devised cultural policy in preparation of "liberalisation" of socialism in the C.S.S.R. and in order to bring about "changes in the communist world showing results in politics".

Stipends for Softening-up

Early this year the U.S. magazine *Christian Science Monitor* brought a report on a discussion with an official representative of the Bonn government who commented on the significance of cultural relations within the framework of the so-called "new Eastern policy" in these terms: "Political relations are a matter for two established governments. Culture, however, deals with individuals. We, therefore, turn our mind to individuals who, because of their role in the life of their country, are able to exert, in turn, their influence on their government."

One of the main practices to organise ideological diversion on a broad basis, was to invite as many artists, film-workers, writers and sociologists of the C.S.S.R. to West Germany, to establish continual contacts with them and "to develop most extensive cultural exchanges just as well as trade relations with the least possible noise, irrespective of whether cultural agreements are actually concluded or not", as *Die Welt* commented. According to data supplied by that daily, "which will surprise many people", not only 250,000 citizens of the Federal Republic paid a visit to Czechoslovakia in 1967, but also 120,000 Czechoslovaks had gone to the Federal Republic during that year, "including great numbers of invited students, artists and professors".

Dialogue with a Subversive Radio Station

The number of students who went to West Germany by virtue of this scheme, was, according to the *Christian Science Monitor*, "phantastically high, but a secret" in order not to arouse too much of a stir. Over and above this the Prague embassies of Western countries and the West German Trade Mission multiplied their efforts to intensify the dialogue with Czechoslovak intellectuals. Approximately 80,000

Czechoslovak citizen, including great numbers of artists, writers and journalists, were looked after by them in 1967 alone.

Various levels and channels were made use of to establish "revolutionary situations" in the socialist countries by a systematic brain-washing especially of young people and intellectuals with the objective of infiltrating bourgeois ideologies into the C.S.S.R. and to suit the purposes of U.S. global strategy. Thus the station "Radio Free Europe" conducted a dialogue with the Czechoslovak periodical *Student*. The West German writers' "Group 47" planned to hold one of its meetings in Prague. Czech and Slovak scientists, by accepting stipends from the Humboldt-Foundation and the (West)German Academic Exchange Service, were leading among the numbers of foreign scientists who were thereby enabled to study in the Federal Republic.

At the same time, the imports of West German cultural products were systematically stepped up. According to the Frankfurt *Boersenverein* two fifths of Western books imported to the C.S.S.R., come from the Federal Republic. The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* reports: "West Germany thereby stands at the top of the literary transit traffic to Czechoslovakia ahead of all other Western European countries. Many of the editions of (West)German titles achieve higher figures than the original editions..."

On being questioned about the literature of the G.D.R. the writer Kohout replied: "I do not know the conditions there... I only have contacts with West Germany."

But especially in the West German mass media, in television, radio and the imperialist daily press, the intellectual protagonists of the Czechoslovak counter-revolution were accorded active support for spreading their anti-socialist concepts of "division of power", of political emasculation of the working class and its party. A short time ago the quarterly *Politik* wrote in an interim report on West German-Czechoslovak

relations: "For the young Czechs and Slovaks the Federal Republic is gradually gaining a similar significance as America had for the young Germans forty years ago, namely as the country of unlimited opportunities."

Brzezinski's "Brain Trust"

The outstanding result of that development, however, consisted in the fact that imperialist global strategists, revisionists, such as Ernst Fischer and the counter-revolutionary "brain trust" of the C.S.S.R. merged their forces in complete harmony for undermining the socialist system.

This harmony found its most blatant expression in basic political issues. In his lecture given in Prague, before leading representatives of the counter-revolutionary "brain trust", Mr. Zbigniew Brzezinski rejected Leninism as an obsolete doctrine. Writer Vaculik denied in fact that the working class and its party had any ability to exercise political power and, by borrowing from Ernst Fischer's revisionist theories, advocated the establishment of a society led by intellectuals. Instead of waging the struggle against imperialism, for peace and security in Europe, the thesis of a class-indifferent "European cooperation" was put forward which ignored especially the threat which emanates from West German imperialism and opened wide the floodgates to the import of imperialist ideologies.

It would be of great benefit to peace and security in Europe if Czechoslovak scientists and cultural workers helped in West Germany to expose the reactionary nature of West German imperialism, its aggressive character, and strengthen those social forces which—like the Communist Party of Germany—wage an upright struggle against monopoly capital and Bonn's policy. But this was hardly in question. Most contacts were characterised by the fact that

Czechoslovak writers, artists or scientists took up the positions of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois forces in West Germany and stopped their struggle against West German imperialism.

Czechoslovak historians expressed the opinion that the exposure of German imperialism and the struggle with the revanchist forces had come to an end. A young generation of historians had grown up in West Germany which had to be judged not by their political but by their methodical concepts and their significance for their particular branch of science. The logical result was that a growing section of the Czechoslovak historians gave up their Marxist-Leninist standpoint in these discussions and took up bourgeois positions particularly in important questions of the communist and workers' movement.

The Slovak historian Daniel Rapant for instance proposes that the definition "Central Europe" be used as a basis for proposals for the solution of the German question. "The economic, political and social discrepancy between the two German states could be solved in the first stage by a superordinate federation. Later on a convergence between capitalism and socialism could take place in Germany. The neutralization should, however, cover not only the German people."

Bankrupt Strategy

West German circles have repeatedly described as glad tidings, that the protagonists of imperialist global strategy and their "new Eastern policy" had succeeded in achieving a far-reaching agreement on basic political issues with Czechoslovak artists and scientists in the spirit of the "European concept" developed by Franz Josef Strauss. The West German periodical *Europäische Begegnung* placed particular emphasis on the fact that through such meeting "even

the Federal Government had received useful stimuli for its Eastern policy".

To summarize: The open appearance of the counter-revolution in the C.S.S.R. was the outcome of a protracted and all-embracing intellectual preparation in which the imperialist ideologists, petty-bourgeois intellectuals and right-wing forces within the party collaborated. For all of them it was characteristic that they met on the grounds of bourgeois ideology and take a stand against the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism. As a result of this very fact they have lost the ability to arrive at a realistic assessment of the historic processes and the character of our epoch. The "new Eastern policy" has come to naught. The defeat of the counter-revolution and its intellectual vanguard has been an objective necessity.

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin, September 10, 11, and 12, 1968)

Wehner and Brandt Lament their Defeat

by Harri Czepuck

The social democratic leadership in West Germany admitted on August 28, under an unequalled clatter of words, the defeat suffered by their policy on August 21, without, however, drawing the necessary conclusions. Still, it first remains to the chronicler to note that this occurred after 21 months of Kiesinger rule. Erhard made this admission after three years. Adenauer after 14 years.

Instead of now reflecting and finally changing their policy the social democratic leaders protest their innocence and cling in desperation to the rotten shaft of their banner under which they crept into the Grand Coalition with Kiesinger and Strauss in December 1966. In this they implore the federal government simply to continue the revanchist and expansionist policy as it has been conducted up to now. They openly appeal not to sign the atomic weapon non-proliferation treaty, to strengthen NATO and also this in agreement with Strauss—to consolidate the "West European community". According to them all of this is to serve as aid for the Czechoslovak people.

We do not want to deal very long with the question of the extent to which the Bonn revanchist policy up to now was an "aid" for the Czechoslovak people. The support of the counter-revolutionary forces by the Bonn government and the right-wing social de-

mocratic leaders is just as "helpful" to the people as Bonn's support for the anti-popular and counter-revolutionary Ky regime in South Vietnam. For in truth, Bonn policy with the help of the right-wing social democratic leaders was aimed—as Chancellor Kiesinger formulated it—at changing the status quo in Europe, that is, shifting the relationship of forces in Europe in favour of capitalism, which would be equivalent to an increase in the danger of war, as we know from the year 1938. In any case that was the intention of the counter-revolutionary activity.

We have often pointed out that counter-revolution can have various faces, various forms of appearance. In the truest sense of the word it is the counter-movement directed against the revolutionary movement of our time—socialism. The counter-revolution in whatever form it appears is the attempt to restore capitalism ideologically, politically and finally militarily.

The objective counter-revolutionary role of West German social democracy after 1945 consists in the fact that it helped to restore capitalism on West German soil and hastened to its aid in its up to then most serious post-war crisis in 1966 in order to salvage its policy. The task of the social democratic ministers in the Kiesinger-Strauss government consisted of this and in nothing else. They were to make possible in other ways under the social democratic flag the policy of West German post-war imperialism which failed in the frontal attack with the aim of again expanding its sphere of power to the East. "New Eastern policy" stood on this social democratic flag.

Especially against the G.D.R.

The social democratic ministers seek, faithful to their "new Eastern policy" of isolating the GDR within the socialist community, to direct the loudest abuse against our state and against our party.

From their point of view it is even understandable for the G.D.R. has essentially contributed to the fact that the content of their "new Eastern policy" was so quickly exposed and thereby also condemned to failure. Our assessments have proved to be correct and not the illusions which existed here and there about the "new Eastern policy" and about the "social democratic alternative".

That rests quite simply on the fact that our party found itself in constant confrontation with the class enemy and also had to constantly deal with the attitude and policy of the right-wing social democratic leaders on national and social questions ever since 1914, on to 1918, 1933, 1946 and right up to the present day.

Because we spoilt their "new Eastern policy" they are now especially angry with us. We shall put up with that and further vigilantly defend ourselves against all attempts at ideological diversion and psychological warfare. For they already seek to peddle their "peace policy" with new phrases.

Abysmal Hypocrisy

But are not all the protestations of peace by Wehner, Brandt and Schmidt abysmal hypocrisy when at the same time the atomic weapon non-proliferation treaty and the contractual renunciation of the use of force, when the GDR proposals in the People's Chamber session of 9 August and the nullification of the Munich Agreement from the very beginning are rejected? The social democratic ministers now do before support the revanchist organizations because they support Bonn's revanchist policy. At a so-called "All-German pre-parliament" 24 social democratic deputies made common cause with representatives of the Thadden party. In lower Saxony not only representatives of the C.D.U. and F.D.P., but also representatives of the Social Democratic Party entered

election alliances with the neo-nazi N.P. They suddenly discover—if one were to believe their words—their heart for communists in Czechoslovakia.

But their policy in their own country and their position show where they stand in reality: to the far right, it is hardly possible to be farther to the right. There is Herr Brandt, whose foreign ministry is crawling with old nazis. There is Herr Wehner who coordinates all revanchist actions against the G.D.R. There is Herr Schiller who makes economic policy for and with war economy leaders, and finally, there is Helmut Schmidt, the intimate of various Bundeswehr generals.

And these people seek to affirm that they have nothing to do with the counter-revolution in Czechoslovakia, that they love socialism in that country?

How stupid do these people think we are when they of all people now all of a sudden refer to the Potsdam Agreement? The recollection of the Potsdam Agreement comes precisely from the state where the right-wing social democratic leaders helped to ensure that the war criminal trusts were not expropriated, where the land reform was not carried out, where nazi jurists and generals sit in key positions, where the war economy leaders remained.

We have put all that behind us in the GDR. West Germany still awaits a democratic purging. Right-wing social democratic leaders should therefore be extraordinarily reticent about giving advice to socialist countries. It is impossible for Wehner to play the innocent lamb.

At Whose Cost?

Such things do not tell on us. But the social democratic comrades and friends should for once carefully consider what kind of policy is being conducted in their name. They should make reflections about their position and attitude. We have pointed out that

the policy of Wehner and Brandt had to end with defeat and at the cost of the Social Democratic Party. Such declarations as that of 28 August were to divert attention from these facts. But nevertheless the fact remains that the present policy of Wehner, Brandt and Schmidt is directed against the interests of their own people because it—as has been proved—is subordinated to the interests of West German imperialism.

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin, September 11, 1968)

The Anti-Socialist Economic Program of Mr. Ota Šik

Observations by Professor Gerhard Schulz

What is necessary for being "awarded" the title of "neo-communist" or "reform-communist" by people known throughout the world as mortal enemies of communism? If, in addition, one is not merely included in the circle of "neo-communists", but also praised by the imperialists with unconcealed admiration as a hero of economic and political reform, then one's contribution towards undermining socialism can hardly have been a minor one, but must be usually important indeed.

In view of the achievements of Mr. Ota Šik (former director of the Economic Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, then Deputy Prime Minister, now retired), he was recommended to the readers of important imperialist periodicals as one of "the most important East European economists" (*West German Wirtschaftsdienst* 1966/III, p. 129), as a major exponent of economic reform, as its "strongest advocate" (*Industriekurier* of August 22, 1968, p. 3), as "the most prominent member of the highest Economic Council" (*Der Volkswirt* of July 26, 1968, p. 20). In the *Volkswirt* cited above he received as a reward for his services a not very flattering but not misleading nickname; the "red Erhard of Czechoslovakia".

Common Ground with Erhards' Concepts

In other words, he was compared with the men in the imperialist West Germany who demagogically dug into the wastepaper basket of pre-monopolistic capitalism after 1945, dragged out the concept, long since exposed as a lie, of a "social market economy" and then preached a "prosperity for everyone" which he never achieved. And in fact there is much in common between Šik's "market socialism" and Erhard's "social market economy".

Šik moved with the greatest energy "to do away with out-of-date Marxist economic views" (*Süddeutsche Zeitung* of August 22, 1968), and his economic model represents "a radical rejection of hitherto existing forms of dogmatic economic policy". One of the main causes of the present ideological confusion in Czechoslovakia is the series of publications by Šik in which the greatest amount of space is devoted to past economic difficulties and false methods of economic leadership, as well as to mistakes in the past which have only just been discovered. Despite the fact that by 1958 the volume of production of the Czechoslovak economy was double that of 1937, which meant considerable improvements in the living standards of the working people, Šik says that the economic development of Czechoslovakia was on the whole negative. All difficulties—even the objective problems connected with growth—were called the result of a "useless and damaging system of administrative leadership", corresponding to a sum of the view in the "period of the cult" (*Nova Mysl* 10/1964) and "terribly uneconomic" (*West German Wirtschaftsdienst* 1966/III).

Sober analyses are, of course, an important element of economic leadership: nevertheless, one must ask why these analyses of past mistakes were dealt with publicistically so very extensively both at home and in other countries. It has been typical of Šik that he conducted his complete criticism and negation of

everything achieved thus far most sharply in the imperialist press of the Western countries, and thus became the most-quoted authority whenever imperialist mass media wanted to vilify the socialist achievements of Czechoslovakia.

Step-by-step Rejection of Established Principles

Basing himself on two economic models constructed by bourgeois economist Walter Eucken in order to denigrate capitalism—that of the "communist economy of command or force" and the "market economy"—Šik contrasted the "new economic system" with the "old, administrative" system. Proceeding from this position, he tried to torpedo principles of socialist economic leadership which are still vital today, to develop further his anti-socialist concepts and, step by step, to implement them. Let us take a closer look at Mr. Šik's "market economy-socialism" and his step-by-step program for attaining it, which incidentally corresponds in every way to the global strategy of imperialism.

Firstly: The influence of the party on the economy is to be rapidly decreased, a view which has not occupied Šik for the first time in this current year. Whereas in past years his attacks did not name the party directly, their target gradually became unmistakable, and he finally stated: "The root of the evil is in the political sphere, in the general working methods of the party", (*Weg und Ziel*, Vienna, 4/1968). In a speech to the plenary session of the Economic Society he called for a "sharp separation of the party from all its previous representations" and spoke against over-estimating the influence of anti-socialist forces. Finally, at the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia on June 5th, he demanded that the "conservative

comrades" should "resign their membership in the Central Committee".

In accord with imperialist advisers, the goal was to bar the party as a leading force in socialist society from any influence in the decisive economic sphere and to transform it from a fighting party into a social democratic party. But leadership by the working class and its party is and remains the basic prerequisite for the power and strength of the working people. It is the decisive guarantee for further strengthening and increasing the achievements of socialism, for attaining a high degree of efficiency in the economy and for strengthening the socialist community.

Basic Prerequisite for the People's Power

This requires above all the further development and the collective application of Marxism-Leninism, a full social prognosis and the broad fixation of the main tasks towards social development, increasing general consciousness and socialist democracy. Building up socialism is at the same time a bitter class struggle against imperialism, a battle which can only be led successfully by the working class and its party.

Secondly: another cornerstone of Šik's economic concept is the decrease in the economic role of the socialist state, especially of central state planning and management. He insisted that the economic role of the government be reduced to a few questions of credit and wage policy. "All decisions in micro-economic planning (factory planning, the ed.) should come from below." (*Osteuropa*, No. 3/1968, p. 218). In the same connection he told the West German *Wirtschaftsdienst* 1966/III: "We must move away from previous views on directive planning. The plans must take on more the character of orientation plans... and only be plans for longer periods." The short-term plans are a matter for the different enterprises, which can "be brought to the attention of the centre".

The *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of June 28, 1968 rejoiced that the socialist state as a representative of all working people was to be transformed "into a controlling 'night-watchman'". And the same monopoly newspaper found "...the rapid dismantling and collapse of economic Stalinism and its institutions which had been valid in Czechoslovakia till now... fascinating", because, in the face of aggressive West German imperialism, the decisive political instrument of the workers' and farmers' power and for defence of their state was to be abandoned.

In his book *Plan and Market Under Socialism*, Šik criticises the other socialist countries for not following his directions for decreasing central planning rapidly enough: "All the efforts to limit the exaggerated degree of centralistic decision-making and to improve the system of centrally-planned duties and index figures which have been undertaken in recent years in the socialist countries are not based sufficiently on fundamental analyses of the relationship between centralized and decentralized management and have led, or are still leading therefore for the most part, merely to reforms and reorganization of limited value." He thus reduces democratic centralism—the basic principle of socialist economic management—to a purely quantitative proportion between centralization and decentralization, which he would like to alter in the direction of an all-round decentralization of economic decision-making, while constantly repeating the slogan for "planning as little as necessary and freedom as much as possible", as if the two were incompatible. The really constructive question is, however, how further to develop democratic centralism qualitatively and how to form the organic connection between highly-qualified central planning in basic questions and self-responsible economic activity by the separate enterprises.

When Šik raises the question of the effectiveness of economic-political reforms, he carefully overlooks the fact that the discussion of past mistakes and the

reforms of the economy which he pursued in Czechoslovakia have led to sinking rates of growth, while in the G.D.R. and other socialist countries there are high and stable rates of growth in the sphere of economic development. In recent weeks, the Czechoslovak economy suffered thousands of millions in losses for which Šik created the decisive ideological and economic conditions. In the London *Tribune* the Englishman Edgar P. Young asks "why an economic system, nearly identical with the one that has allegedly been a 'failure' in your country (Czechoslovakia, the ed.), has been a brilliant success in the German Democratic Republic, despite greater difficulties facing that country in connection with trading with the West."

Thirdly: With his attack against central planning Šik wanted to free the individual enterprise, as the basic unit of the economy from "tutelage from above". As a man "fighting to remove the fetters of an orthodox plan-bureaucracy", he insisted on "removing the governmental protective measures for the enterprises". His autonomous enterprises could then independently decide on accepting credits, or even on investment partnerships with capitalist concerns. At a press conference in Prague on May 14th, Šik declared that Austria, West Germany, Italy, Belgium and France especially had expressed interest in direct cooperation with Czechoslovak enterprises.

Social Security Goes Overboard

Šik views the "rigorous liquidation of inefficient enterprises" as a fitting method for re-deploying workers. Competition between the enterprises and unemployment are both part of Šik's concept. He has no scruples in abandoning all social security, so that imperialist periodicals have repeatedly raised the question as to whether Czechoslovakia, like Yugoslavia, would face unemployment (*Aussenpolitik* 2/1968, p. 94).

Imperialist ideologists were immediately prepared to correct socialist dictionaries in which "unemployment" is defined quite correctly as a category of capitalism. Autonomous enterprises, competitive struggles, partnerships with capitalist monopolies are all a fitting basis for "a transformation into regular calculating and balancing stock companies" (*Christ und Welt* of June 28, 1968). An appetite for profits was soon registered as well. "The liberalisation in Czechoslovakia means that economic channels, though slowly, are now beginning to open. From now on not only the German Mark of the tourist but also the hard currency of Western economic partners will be welcome. They now have the chance to make profits in this socialist country which wants to democratize itself so thoroughly" (*Hannoversche Presse* of June 20, 1968). In order to complete the system of profit-making and create an escape valve for unemployment, "the President of the Federal Institute for Labour Exchange and Unemployment Insurance, Josef Stingl, has given the assurance to accept Czech guest workers without formalities. This would support the Prague structural measures" (*Die Welt* of August 8, 1968).

Fourthly. By way of foreign trade, Czechoslovakia was to be extracted from the Council of Mutual Economic Aid (Comecon). The share of foreign trade with the socialist countries organized in this council was to be reduced appreciably and the quota with the capitalist industrial countries of Western Europe decisively increased. This is neither in compliance with the long-term obligations towards the socialist countries in the council nor is it economically realizable.

The Result Would Be Price Increases

As the results of reform efforts in Yugoslavia show, not many enterprises are able to hold their ground alone in competitive struggle with the capitalist

monopolies and to penetrate deeper into the capitalist market under the prevailing enterprise autonomy. At the same time, all gates for the import of Western commodities have been opened, and these imports increased more rapidly than the exports which were impeded by the barriers of the Common Market and the Free Trade Association. Price increases for consumer goods and shops overstocked with goods were the result. Approximately 1/5 Czechoslovakia's foreign trade is with the capitalist industrial states of Western Europe. Even maintaining this quota requires very great efforts.

Šik's intention to cut sharply the foreign trade quota with the socialist countries is considered a vicious circle even by imperialist economic experts. "The problems of foreign trade are given sufficient attention, it is true, but in a way which seems more a list of pious wishes than a direction of realistic reform" (*Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of June 26, 1968).

Fifthly: Šik hoped to be able to push through his concept with the help of credit injections from Western countries. The imperialist nations made credit grants dependent on Czechoslovakia's willingness for liberalisation, in other words, on whether Czechoslovakia was "really serious about its reforms". The West German monopoly publication *Christ und Welt* called for a fitting reward for Šik's liberalisation concepts. "It is possible to speak sensibly with state capitalist market economists, who are now replacing the planned economy ideologists. With Marxist-Leninist doctrinaires this is impossible. The peoples who shake off such doctrinaires need a helping hand padded with Western currency in order to decrease at least somewhat the prosperity gap which has grown up in two unhappy decades." The *Rheinische Merkur* of May 17, 1968 even raised the prospect of "a European repetition of the Marshall Plan".

An Out-of-Date Regulating Principle

Šik embellished his anti-socialist concept with "market socialism", although market automatism as a principle for regulating the economy has long been invalid. More than fifty years ago, Lenin pointed out "that free competition leads to the concentration of production, and this concentration, at a certain state of its development, leads to monopoly." (Lenin: *Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Complete Works, Volume 22, p. 204, German edition, unauthorized translation). Monopoly is a negation of free competition. He showed that all dreams of a "return to 'free', 'peaceful', 'honest' competition" are essentially "petty bourgeois-reactionary criticism of capitalist imperialism" (*ibid.*, p. 211). But for Šik, nevertheless, the market and not the plan is the crucial category and major criterion for all economic decisions.

The classical bourgeois model of a market economy, in which supply and demand obey the laws of the market and an invisible hand regulates everything, is also valid for Löbl, the director of the State Bank of Bratislava. He compares the market to a sports match, "where athletes test their abilities against each other and thus objective criteria are created". (*Ost-West Forum*, Frankfurt/Main, July 3, 1968). Correcting production in conformity with impulses from the market would mean purposely organising a rear-guard position in the scientific-technological revolution. In reality, the main directions for development in science and technology and for structural changes in the economy require prognoses of all phases of the reproduction process, not least of all the market.

Managerial School and its Program

Šik used every chance to implement his concept. *Der Spiegel* (No. 34/1968) reported: "A new generation

of Czechoslovak factory managers are already being prepared for their unusual duties by Šik's team. In the little baroque palace of Kolodeje near Prague, top leaders of heavy industry, in groups of twenty at a time, are taking short courses in sales and organisation according to capitalist standards."

Since Šik is devoted to the convergence theory and has repeatedly stated that there is no real difference between socialism and capitalism (*Wirtschaftsdienst* 1966/III), his school of management and its program is in no way surprising. Löbl has characterized this economic concept as a symbiosis of the American method, with its managerial rule, and the Yugoslav method (in a radio interview, July 3, 1968, in Frankfurt/Main). Even K. C. Thalheim, a consistent opponent of the thesis of a rapprochement of the two systems and a known anti-communist, stated: "If what Mr. Šik has presented here is carried out, then it is truly a transformation of the system, and I would then indeed see a mutual approach of the economic systems." (K. C. Thalheim: *Probleme zentraler Wirtschaftsplanung*, Oldenbourg Verlag, Munich 1967, p. 73). For Thalheim, only capitalism has a future; any other system must necessarily adapt itself to it.

Socialism without central state planning and leadership, but instead with autonomy for its enterprises, an investment partnership with monopolies, with competitive struggle, price increases and unemployment—these are all things we fail to comprehend. If the enterprises are autonomous, the interests of each enterprise becomes independent, which would mean price increases and economic disproportions. This interests of society become completely secondary. This opens the floodgates to inflation. A harmonious development of the economy can by no means be guaranteed when socialist enterprises fight amongst themselves for the most advantageous production and sales positions. The socialist enterprises would then compete with one another in the capitalist market, acting as rivals for credit grants from

the monopolies, which would be the ones to profit most from this process.

In such a competitive struggle, a differentiation of enterprises would develop. Weaker enterprises, instead of being helped to employ the experience of the best enterprises in order to benefit the whole economy and work efficiently and profitably, would fall by the wayside. Bankruptcy would then become a respectable method of redeploying workers; the question remains unclear just who would organize and finance the resulting change of enterprise for the worker, the alteration of his seniority or job status, his moving from one home to another, his preparation for a new trade and countless other difficulties for the worker and his family—to say nothing of the human problems involved.

The development of the productive forces, especially of science and technology, would be limited by the size of the enterprise. But unless enterprises orient themselves in accordance with the main trends in science and technology, in keeping with a structural concept of the economy, their economic potential cannot reach its optimum level, and a huge waste of both resources and labour power is the result.

Integration with the Monopolies

Distribution of labour power to the different branches of the economy would take place by means of an elementary scuffle amongst the enterprises. The integration with capitalist monopolies would open the way to all the concomitants of competition, anarchy and the instability of capitalism. The workers would face this competitive struggle without power or protection. Unemployment and work abroad in capitalist countries, substantial price increases instead of a consistent struggle to lower costs and increase labour productivity are by no means socialist achievements

and certainly have nothing at all in common with socialist democracy.

According to our view of socialism, on the other hand, socialist planning and management must guarantee the security of all working people as the most fundamental socialist obligation, and the needs of the working people must be ever better satisfied. Egoistic group interests should not be encouraged, but rather socialist relationships of comradely mutual aid and assistance. The working people must work together with the government, looking far ahead into the future, in order to achieve the most effective solutions possible. Thus, what Šik refers to as the "fetters of planbureaucracy"—that is, the allotting of main proportions, the directions for development and economic conditions (such as the legal norms for business relations between enterprises, and long-term norms for economic activity)—in other words, a minimum of basic quantities—these add up in effect to the basic advantage of socialism, as a prerequisite for self-responsible economic activity by the enterprises and for the social security of the workers, whose factories are not left helplessly in the vortex of capitalist competition.

Conditions for a healthy Development

In order to be able to choose the most effective variant of the scientific-technological revolution and the change of structure and to employ science, technology and foreign trade relationships efficiently it is necessary to make economic decisions which go well beyond the sphere of any one enterprise, and which therefore make necessary central governmental planning and management as the economic foundation of workers' and farmers' power. In this way, many economic effects (the structural, proportionality and organisational effects) can be achieved on the basis of the whole economic system. Under the condi-

tions of the scientific-technological revolution, central government planning and management of the economy are the elementary foundation for the effectiveness of the whole reproduction process and for improving the living standards of the working people. Šik's concept would lead to a liquidation of all socialist advantages and the withdrawal of Czechoslovakia from the socialist camp. As the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* of August 22, 1968 complains, all hopes for achieving this concept have now sunk to the zero level.

(From *Berliner Zeitung*, Berlin, September 11, 1968)

Ernst Fischer at the End of an Illusion

by Dr Hajo Herbell

Ernst Fischer, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Austria has again presented himself on West German television. We say again because by now it has been a whole number of times. Each time the content corresponded to the objectives of this institution. So our readers may remember that already in July 1966 we engaged in a polemic against one of his appearances. At that time Fischer had helped his Bonn partners of the discussion to slander the Communist Party of Germany and its popular front policy, our Socialist Unity Party and the G.D.R. At the end of March this year he encouraged the counter-revolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia on West German television. He argued in favour of "pluralism" in socialist society. He lectured on the allegedly necessary "opposition to the Establishment", meaning the existing power of the workers and farmers under the leadership of the Communist Party.

In his most recent appearance Fischer surpassed, in fact, all his past statements. That was obviously in connection with the time: It occurred *after* the aid of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states on August 21. When Fischer saw that his hopes of the spring were not being fulfilled he appeared before the West German television and took the opportunity to give vent to his rage and present his entire revisionist attitude hostile to the international workers' move-

ment. In the "Panorama" broadcast of September 9, he cooperated in the formulation or subsequent revelation of the program of the counter-revolution.

Division

The first point on the program is the division of the international communist movement. Fischer says he considers it "the duty of all communist parties in the West to call a European conference in order unanimously to condemn the act of force of the Soviet Union, the Soviet leaders".

Thus, to Fischer it is not a question of condemning the acts of force of imperialism, the counter-revolutionary onslaughts against socialism. He rather wants to condemn just those actions of the socialist states which placed an iron barrier in front of imperialist acts of force in Europe. Fischer does not want the coordination of our forces in the struggle against imperialism inspired to by all honest socialists. He wants a separatist western conference against the brother parties in the socialist countries. He says quite bluntly that there must be "an independent, autonomous movement". Talkative as he is, Fischer elucidated these thoughts still further a day after the "Panorama" telecast in a West Berlin radio station: "I am for a new left wing." Thus instead of unanimity, division. Not a strengthening but a weakening of the movement.

Who still doubts that Fischer is here directly conducting the business of the classe enemy? Moreover, he presumes to speak in the name of all European communist parties. It may be doubted that he has been charged to engage in divisionist activity by the West German communists, the French Communist Party, the Finnish party leadership or the communists of Greece.

Anti-Sovietism

The second point on his program which arises with fatal logic out of the first is the venomous thrust against the Soviet Union. It, which is first slandered with the words "acts of force", is furthermore—so absurd is his project—to be isolated. Fischer says: "I consider it to be a moral and political command to break off relations with the present leadership of the Soviet party. Fine morality! It should not be necessary to state here that the attitude to the Soviet Union is and remains for every real communist the test of morality, of his thinking and action. Still, Fischer is considered to be a learned man—does he not know that even bourgeois democrats considered the attitude to the Soviet Union as a criterion of reason and humanist spirit? That was true of Romain Rolland and Theodore Dreiser, of Heinrich Heine and Thomas Mann, of Käthe Kollwitz and Albert Einstein.

Nothing of their attitude is expressed by the "communist" Ernst Fischer. Like the potentate of an operetta state who has gone wild he screams: "Break off relations!" Not meaning the relations with the Franco-German clique, with Salazar, Johnson or even the West German television bosses, but with the party and country of Lenin, with the country which made the most heroic performances and sacrifices for the international working-class movement, for all peoples of the world. Fischer wants to have nothing to do anymore with the first victorious communist party on earth. Instead he conceitedly permits himself to be announced as a "theoretician of communism" before the cameras by the dyed-in-the-wool anti-communists in West Germany...

Counter-Revolution

Point three of the program. Fischer, to whom it was not given to be a member of a victorious party in power, nevertheless possesses an imposing experience as to

how socialism can be constructed most purposefully, that is, incomparably better than in the socialist countries. He announces as dogma the "right of various parties to compete with each other" and to create "real alternatives". Now this thesis of various parties does not signify anything special to us. In the G.D.R. we have, in fact, various parties and their friendly cooperation is a great strength of our socialist development. But Fischer couples the demand for various parties with that of an "alternative". And here one may be allowed a question: an alternative to what? To socialism, of course. And what is the alternative to socialism called? It is called capitalism—history has abundantly proved that there is no such thing as the much-cited "third way".

No, what Fischer wants is really the "pluralism" mentioned at the beginning, that is, the re-establishment of the historically obsolete social democratic or plain bourgeois parties. What Fischer wants is a bourgeois-social democratic state. Thus Fischer has obediently followed the tracks of Strauss, Barzel and Brandt, the "eastern experts" Mehnert and the Johnson adviser Brzezinski. In trusting community with them he represents the program of historical retrogression, the counter movement to socialism, and that is called simply: counter-revolution.

Causes and Judgments

If one reduces it to a common denominator, the deep despair at the defeat imposed on the revisionists and splitters of the international workers' movement speaks out of Fischer's unconcealed anti-socialist program. Something else also possibly played a role: In 1945 Fischer was in fact a communist minister in the Austrian government. At that time he was not able to develop an alliance with social democratic workers on a Marxist-Leninist basis. He was not capable of using the power and safeguarding it by a clever policy of anti-

fascist democratic alliance. Is it this recollection which instils Fischer with abhorrence of power as such? That permits him to say such senseless things as: Now "the mask of power has covered the face of socialism"—just as if socialism were not the power of the working people?

Is it the recollection of 1945 which leads Fischer to conclude: That mustn't be, and anyone who proved the contrary should finally stop? He should please crawl back into the womb of the bourgeois state too?—like Ernst Fischer who during his appearance in a West German TV series at the same time represented the interests of the capitalist Austrian government which is closely linked with Bonn.

One must admit, a fine "communist"! A "theoretician" of high rank! To be sure, that has long been known, and not only here. Springer's Welt for example, which so likes to prattle with his theories, disparagingly called Fischer in its literary supplement, someone who goes "through the battlefields of the world civil war without orientation"—a discreet circumlocution for a renegade who uses socialist phrases and makes anti-socialist policy. The bourgeois Munzinger Archiv remarked in the last paragraph of its Fischer biography: "He creates a certain embarrassment for his party." That is less discreet and in principle corresponds to our view of things. We are, in fact, convinced that the Austrian working class, that the consistent Marxist-Leninists in Austria will come to grips with Fischer and smash his anti-Soviet, anti-labour platform.

For fairness' sake let us give Ernst Fischer a final quote: In the "Panorama" telecast he said: "For me an illusion has come to an end." We believe it. Should Fischer in a fit of realism have meant the illusion that he could still be regarded as a communist and be respected as such by us?

(From Neues Deutschland, Berlin, September 13, 1968)

Revisionist Game of Chess with Imperialism

by Ernst-Peter Adler

The katzenjammer on the Rhine is only too understandable. The plans to break the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (CSSR) out of the world socialist system and thus to bring about the change in the status quo conceived by Strauss and sought by Bonn were shipwrecked in August 1968. Kiesinger's statement that the result of the Czechoslovak-Soviet consultations in Moscow from 23rd to 26th August was "not welcome" to him spoke volumes.

As so often in history the German imperialists incorrectly assessed the international relationship of forces. This time, however, similarly to August 1961, they were repulsed before they could set Europe on fire. The forces of international socialism are today powerful enough to prevent a potential aggression in time and to safeguard peace in Europe.

The concept of imperialist forces of transforming Czechoslovakia step-by-step into a bourgeois state dependent upon NATO envisaged a concerted procedure on various levels. Here, two directions of thrust were clearly evident: first, the attack on the leading role of the working class, its party and the socialist state power, which was carried out on all levels of social life by open counter-revolutionary elements and by revisionist forces within the CPCZ playing into their hands, and secondly, the gradual foreign policy re-orientation of the CSSR which was to lead from a

nationalist distortion of the principles and methods of foreign policy to a detachment from the socialist community of states, thereby creating favourable conditions for the development of a creeping counter-revolution.

At the Beginning: Class Standpoint Given Up

Also in the planned reorientation of Czechoslovak foreign policy the efforts of imperialist forces from without joined the revisionist forces from within. In this connection it is instructive to investigate some activities of the Institute of International Politics and Economics in Prague, all the more so, as it is close to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

For quite a long time already, at least since 1960, the revision of basic ideas of the Marxist-Leninist science of international relations was part of the activities pursued by leading members of the staff of the institute. This is borne out by the fact that various foreign policy analyses lacked any class position. The starting point was not the dispute between imperialism and socialism and the reflection of this main contradiction of the present period in the various spheres of international relations. In addition there was an erroneous assessment of West German imperialism, the aggressiveness of which was minimized as well as of the role of the right-wing social democratic leaders in the system of state-monopoly capitalism.

This was shown very clearly at a scientific meeting held in Warsaw in December 1966. Dr. Antonín Šnejdárek, the director of the institute, there characterized the entry of social democratic ministers into the Kiesinger government as the turning of the Federal Republic to a policy taking account of realities and serving relaxation of tension. That should be appropriately promoted. What is more, representatives of the

institute presented the thesis that one must consider international relations and also the relationship between the Federal Republic and the socialist states as a kind of game of chess, as a fair sportsmanlike competition in which it is simply a question of the victory of the more clever, both sides, however, being interested in the maintenance of peace and the general welfare. As in chess, various variants had to be tested out, whereby the enemies of socialism must be treated not as class opponents but as class-indifferent partners in the game.

Behind this naive-sounding thesis there was hidden even at that time an anti-Marxist conception which in reality was directed against the joint efforts of the socialist states for European security. At this time already publications were coming into existence in which the negation of the class position in the assessment of international relations was coming into prominence, the main contradiction of our time was to a large extent neglected, in place of which the authors put nationalist tendencies and purely geographical factors in the foreground.

Thus, Václav Kotyk, head of a department in the institute, in a monograph completed in July 1966, "The World Socialist System", emphasized the national particularities of the individual socialist countries, representing the appearance of antagonisms and contradictions as inevitable, in fact even useful. The model of Yugoslavia was set forth as giving an example in this connection. Whereas Kotyk minimized the concerted action of imperialist forces and counter-revolutionary elements in Hungary in 1956, he made slanderous accusations against the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. With such expressions as "conservative" and "progressive" he in fact anticipated the categories of argument used by anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia in 1968.

Another member of the institute staff, Dr. Jaroslav Sedivý, in February 1967 made himself the advocate of the convergence theory in the weekly periodical of

the Writers' Union, *Literarni Noviny*. Thus he spoke of a "process of unification in Europe", which must first go through "a phase of step-by-step economic co-operation". Hand in hand with this there must be "greater political tolerance". Necessary "modifications in the two social systems will continue in part in the sense of a convergence".

What he meant with these modifications became clear when he named the not more closely defined "changes in the political superstructure" for the socialist countries and in the capitalist countries favoured an orientation on "the newly forming West European left", among which he especially included the leadership of the social democratic parties, for it could only be they which in his words "already now exert a certain pressure on West European policy".

The conclusion then was: "In any case developments in Europe will trend towards European security through European cooperation and not the other way around."

In this essay, too, the basic questions of European security, the necessity of a determined struggle against the revanchist and expansionist ambitions of Bonn, from which the main danger to peace in Europe emanates, and the class assessment of the situation in Europe were avoided. This work and the ideas Snejdarek expounded in Warsaw thus represented an orientation on a "third road" in foreign policy. In its consequence his analysis was tantamount to introducing the separation of Czechoslovakia from the socialist community of states and paving the way for a nationalistic foreign policy between the fronts. The time had not yet come for the representatives of this foreign policy reorientation to present the problem more openly. But all the more did this occur in internal talks in which cooperation with the ideologists of late capitalism was prepared.

Taking up Contacts with Late Capitalism

Among the visitors to the Prague Institute who were able freely to develop their conceptions and offers we find, from West Germany in 1966-67, the social democratic politician Helmut Schmidt and also Müller-Herrmann and Martin of the CDU. They were given the opportunity not only to propagate their anti-communist theses but also to fling mud on the policy of other socialist states, including the GDR.

Already in 1964 and 1965 the American political expert Zbigniew Brzezinski was in the institute. He is one of the authors of the theory of "bridgebuilding" within the framework of the global strategy of US imperialism directed at softening up the world socialist system. On another visit to the Prague Institute in June 1968 he declared that he had been given not a few suggestions by Czechoslovak scientists for his further work, which were then reflected in his theses. In the language of this gentleman it was condescendingly said: "In our opinion, today, twenty years after the end of the war, political cultures are again coming to the surface that have once been here... What is happening in Czechoslovakia seems to us to be a very creative adaptation, the adaptation of socialism to the traditional values and democratic way of acting which was likewise a tradition in Czechoslovakia. We therefore observe what is happening here with sympathy." Brzezinski was at the same time permitted in Prague to express his undisguised antipathy to developments in other socialist countries, in fact, even to slander them or to revile them as "social fascists".

Contacts for the purpose of cooperation with imperialist ideologists were also taken up outside Czechoslovakia. In March 1967 Snejdarek appeared before invited guests of the "German Foreign Policy Society" in Bonn. (Members of the presidium of this society are, among others, Kiesinger, Barzel, Hallstein, Speidel, Abs and Birrenbach. Working hand in glove as vice presidents are Fritz Berg and Helmut Schmidt.)

At that time he also had talks with Klaus Schütz, then state secretary in the Foreign Office and other Bonn politicians.

In October 1967 followed the formation of a Czechoslovak society for economic and cultural relations with the Federal Republic. Its chairman was Antonín Snejdarek. Thereby the organizational prerequisites were created for an intensified collaboration with representatives of the "new eastern policy".

The first major event organized by this society was the Czechoslovak Week in Frankfurt-on-Main in April 1968. The representatives of Czechoslovakia did not use this event to expose the basic revanchist attitude of the Federal Republic, but indulged in considerations of new possibilities for Czechoslovak-West German cooperation. The most important things, however, took place behind the scenes. Within the framework of this Czechoslovak Week, Snejdarek conducted new talks with Barzel, Helmut Schmidt and the ministerial director in the Foreign Office, Rütge. Here Snejdarek was regarded in Bonn as a "semi-official personality" and by some journalists praised as the desirable future ambassador of a reformed Czechoslovakia.

West German newspapers like the big bourgeois dailies *Die Welt* and *Der Tagesspiegel* were able to report these talks that it was a question of intensifying official West German-Czechoslovak relations. In these talks Snejdarek requested his partners at first to exercise reservation outwardly in order not to make difficult the foreign policy reorientation of Czechoslovakia which was bound to the agreements of the Warsaw Treaty states. West German government circles had reported that Bonn would "be further reserved in order not to give Moscow and East Berlin any excuse. German diplomacy, too, will take up a wait-and-see attitude and itself undertake no initiative towards Prague."

Snejdarek and his Bonn interlocutors were obviously agreed that one should not go too far ahead with the taking up of diplomatic relations. And why? Snejdarek had often emphasized that Prague-Bonn relations

would be good even without the existence of embassies. And ideologists of West German imperialism in any case had the opportunity to operate in Czechoslovakia without hindrance. Snejdarek's appearance and that of others in West Germany—at assemblies and on radio and television—was likewise much to the taste of the enemies of socialism. They did not use these forums to expose West German revanchism, but developed a point of view as to how the socialist foundations of the CSSR could be further undermined and how the foreign policy conditions for this could be treated.

In an interview granted to the *Deutschlandfunk* broadcasting station on March 28, 1968 Snejdarek spoke of the necessity of "intensifying efforts to bring about bilateral connections with other states, independently of their social systems. But of course, we can begin with that only when we have mastered the entire political development at home."

That was clear enough. However, the correspondent of the station wanted it to be expressed even more plainly: "Sporadically there have been demands for an active neutrality of the CSSR. How do you see the genuinely realistic possibilities for your country to play a European role again?"

Snejdarek willingly explained the planned tactic. "It is impossible for Czechoslovakia now all at once (sic!) to be neutral." But later "there may really be a neutral zone in Europe . . . To be sure, Czechoslovakia could not begin its new foreign policy by taking up diplomatic relations with the Federal Republic, but one should consider this as a result of a gradual process."

In this connection Snejdarek in fact bracketed the aggressive NATO and the Warsaw defence alliance and emphasized that in his opinion—which in fact was borrowed from the imperialist softening-up ideologists—"the blocs stand in the way of the further development of European cooperation".

The demand for the neutralization of Czechoslovakia raised at a later time, in August, by counter-revolution-

ary forces in Prague was thus hinted at as a perspective by Snejdarek already in spring. In June 1968 Snejdarek had consultations in Bonn on the development of West German-Czechoslovak economic relations. They were to be continued in Prague.

But at the same time the ideological and propagandistic activity of leading members of the staff of the "Institute of International Politics and Economics" in Prague for carrying out a reorientation of Czechoslovak foreign policy was constantly growing. What in 1966-67 was in its early beginnings and presented itself as camouflaged a way as possible was now further developed step by step. Thus Dr Karel Tauber, head of a department in the institute, called the non-existence of diplomatic relations between the CSSR and the Federal Republic "an anachronism" which must absolutely be overcome. He characterized the revanchist basic attitude of Bonn directed against European security, the most concentrated expression of which is the sole representation pretension, as an allegedly internal affair of the Federal Republic in which he did not want to intervene.

Reorientation of Czechoslovak Foreign Policy

Dr Alexander Ort, deputy director of the institute, went still further in an article published in the newspaper *Svobodne Slovo* on May 14, 1968, in which he expressed the desire that Czechoslovakia would take up diplomatic relations with the Federal Republic before the end of summer 1968.

The reorientation of Czechoslovak foreign policy was to bear an unequivocal anti-Soviet accent. Thus the same Alexander Ort favoured several times the revival of the inglorious "Little Entente", in which Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Rumania had joined after the First World War under the patronage of the western powers, in order to strengthen the anti-Soviet course

of the authors of Versailles in South-east Europe. That was the contribution in foreign policy to the return to the traditions of T.G. Masaryk as demanded by anti-socialist forces (Brzezinski paraphrased this in his lecture with the revival of old "political cultures"!).

Such an alliance to which Austria could also belong and in which Alexander Ort would especially like to include Hungary would have to be the expression of an independent Central European policy". It would be clearly directed against the Warsaw Treaty, especially against the G.D.R., the People's Republic of Poland and the U.S.S.R., for the unequivocal rejection of Bonn's revanchist policy obviously did not please Ort. He formulated this as follows: "This perspective (the new edition of the Little Entente) clearly offers itself at a moment in which the complicated German question is not developing favourably and in which to a certain extent the possibility of cooperation in Central Europe is blocked."

The anti-Soviet accent also determined diverse statements and essays in which in the same breath the policy of the "two superpowers" was spoken of, against which the "little and medium-sized states" would have to oppose their independent policy. Antonin Snejdarek emphasized at a scientific consultation of the International Institute of Peace in Vienna in March 1968 the coming into existence of a "feeling of European solidarity" that was the best foundation for European security. Among the bearers of this "feeling of solidarity" he also included the social democratic ministers of the Bonn government and even the main forces of the CDU/CSU, who in his opinion were increasingly tending to adopt a "centrist position". In contradiction to the latter's numerous declarations he claimed that Brandt and Kiesinger are not opponents of the existing frontiers.

Thus was the way paved for the revision of the foreign policy agreed upon by the socialist states. Snejdarek declared that the main requirement of European security was not the joint struggle of the

socialist states and all democratic forces of Western Europe against the policy of aggression emanating from the U.S.A. and the Federal Republic but a cooperation regardless of class conflicts.

In confidential talks with ideologists of West German imperialism Snejdarek then declared in May 1968 in the notorious "Kremlin round" on West German television that cooperation with the imperialist states was a main concern of Czechoslovak foreign policy. It would have to correspond especially with the "geographical position" of Czechoslovakia and seek the construction of a system "of cooperation of all European states which exist in Europe today". This would also require "a refashioning of the foreign policy towards the socialist states".

The "game of chess" with imperialism had become cooperation!

European Security Jeopardized

The opportunist yielding to the aggressive forces, as history teaches, has always harmed peace and European security and paved the way for the aggressors. This is especially true of the present in which the ruling circles of West German imperialism find themselves obliged to camouflage their aggressive intentions in order thus to support the activity of the anti-socialist forces in the best possible way.

At the same time that the counter-revolutionary forces were organizing the decisive attack on the socialist state power in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Snejdarek several times came out in favour of changing the forms and methods of Czechoslovak foreign policy. And on August 20 Snejdarek defined—according to the Ceteka news agency—the tasks of his institute to be "to conduct independent and free scientific research and if necessary (sic!) to express views which in some cases do not agree with official foreign policy". The goal of this research, "independent" as we have seen of Marxism-Leninism

and "freely" relying on tendencies of bourgeois nationalism was, however, "to aid Czechoslovak foreign policy".

The departure from a class standpoint in the assessment of international relations, the over-emphasis on national peculiarities and purely geographical factors, the yielding to the aggressive forces of imperialism coupled with their inclination to accept the offers of the ideologists of "bridge-building" and a refined "new eastern policy"—all this was already a whole program for a new orientation of foreign policy which would have led to the step-by-step withdrawal from the socialist community of states and thereby have been in crass contradiction to the natural interests of a socialist Czechoslovakia. This program must have facilitated the efforts of those imperialist forces which wanted to break Czechoslovakia out of the world socialist system and thus alter the status quo, whereby European security would have been jeopardized.

This dangerous development has been halted by the socialist states. The representatives of Czechoslovakia jointly made the basic declaration with the representatives of the U.S.S.R. at the consultations conducted in Moscow from August 23 to 26, 1968: "Now as before the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia will give a determined rebuff to the militarist, revisionist and neo-nazi forces which want to revise the results of the Second World War and break the inviolability of the existing frontier in Europe. The determination strictly to fulfil the obligations assumed in all multilateral and bilateral treaties between the socialist states, to strengthen the defensive power of the socialist community and raise the effectiveness of the Warsaw defence treaty were confirmed anew."

The more strictly the foreign policy of the C.S.S.R. will be oriented on the fulfilment of this obligation the heavier will be the defeat of the imperialist forces.

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin, September 15 and 17, 1968)

What Was Blessing Doing in Prague?

by Dr Helmut Burg

In the middle of July this year Herr Karl Blessing of Frankfurt-on-Main travelled to Prague for a few days. Hardly returned, and he was irritated. "Herr Blessing was irritated at the fact", reported the British *Guardian*, "that the news of his visit had leaked out and become known to the press, and his spokesman today sought to point out that the visit was of a private nature . . ." And one asks: Since when has Herr Blessing shunned publicity? The answer was to be found that very day in the *Handelsblatt*, an organ of influential circles of the West German monopoly bourgeoisie: "What politicians often find to be well-nigh insuperable obstacles . . . is not seldom much more easily realized by men of money."

A Man of Money

And such a "man of money" is precisely Herr Blessing, president of the West German Federal Bank, an exponent of monopoly and finance capital.

Karl Blessing can look back on a career of almost 50 years. He earned his spurs as an assistant to Hjalmar Schacht, the financier of nazi armament. In this quality he took part in various large international conferences. He became acquainted with the tricks of imperialist power politics to a T, but he especially

learned how to manipulate money as a political instrument.

Blessing was an apt pupil. He proved it after 1933—as a member of the fascist Reich Bank board of directors and as general representative of the Ministry of Economics.

Göring's Accomplice

The methods of imperialist expansion, in practice and theory, became his speciality. Thus he took part in the "reincorporation of Austria" and in the following plundering of the country; in talks with Göring, one of which was on 11 March 1938, the appropriate measures were fixed. Later Blessing was manager of the Continental-Oil-AG, competent for the exploitation of the oil deposits in the East. His activity was so successful that he became a member of the "Circle of Friends of the Reichsführer SS" and "war economy leader". Together with SS brigade commanders Hayler and Ohlen-dorf, Blessing was also active in the "Working Circle for Foreign Economic Questions".

In a lecture held to mark the "Day of German Law" (sic!) Blessing declared with cynical frankness in those years: "In the final analysis it is the whole problem of the unequal distribution of the wealth of this earth that is being debated and that has stepped into the foreground of the world stage just in the last few years. On the one side we see countries poor in raw materials, like Germany and Italy . . ., on the other the areas rich in raw materials, which are neither ready to accept the commodities of the poorer countries for raw materials in sufficient extent, nor to give up suitable raw material areas or colonies to them."

Thousands of Millions for the Aggressor

In view of such connections and "services" who is astonished that Blessing was immediately able to exercise key functions in the Federal Republic? As the

imperialists were gathering their forces he placed his experience, in his position as chairman of the German group of the Unilever trust, at the service of the Americans who helped German imperialism back into the saddle.

By 1957-58 the power of the monopolies was being restored, the time of expansion, armament, the struggle for the regaining of the old positions of power began. The credit system, the banks, played a decisive role in this. The monopolies needed a strong, strictly managed state central bank. It was to continue the traditions of the Reich Bank under Schacht and Funk with new, more elegant methods. Who was more suitable to be president of this Federal Bank than the accomplice of Schacht, Funk and Göring?

Under the management of Karl Blessing the Federal Bank in the past ten years has become a main instrument of imperialist expansion. He employed the experience he had gained during his cooperation with the Americans to make the Federal Bank the best currency policy support of the U.S.A. Without this help the dollar would long since have gone the due way of devaluation. By this means the West German state particularly supports the U.S. aggression against the Vietnam people.

But at the same time the Federal Bank used the relative stability of the West German mark, in comparison with the currency of other imperialist states, to exert economic pressure on other countries in order to consolidate and if possible expand the position of West German imperialism.

The Society of Bankrupts

This is shown especially in the smouldering crisis of the imperialist currency system. Blessing, Schiller and others assume the position of middlemen in the competitive struggle of other imperialist powers, for example, between France and the United States of

America. They seek to get out of their own economic difficulties at the expense of others and to increase their economic and political influence.

Nevertheless, the imperialists can today no longer fight among themselves to the end if they do not want to bring about the rapid collapse of their system. Socialism forces them to prop each other's late capitalist rule. They must, so to say, exercise imperialist solidarity—or better, join the society of bankrupts.

In recent years West Germany has assumed obligations for support actions for other currencies amounting to more than 16 thousand million marks. "The limits of the 'immobilization of German currency reserves' have now been reached", noted the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* on 28 July.

It is clear that such financial obligations also involve political ties. This is shown by the support for the reactionary course in Bonn by other imperialist states. This is expressed in the impudent use of "development aid" for former colonial areas as a means of coercion. And it becomes visible in the activity of West German banks within the framework of the so-called new eastern policy. The Federal Bank plays a guiding role in this.

Herr Blessing was almost ready to retire when the emergency coalition was formed in Bonn. In conformity with the "design" of Strauss, Kiesinger and Brandt spoke of the "new Eastern policy". Its content: "... to break through the inflexible system of spheres of power and interest and create contacts", as the *Handelsblatt* announced a few days ago. In accordance with the capitalist motto "money rules the world" they expected credit to be a means for achieving "commercial integration", and a "loosening up" of the political scene or a "brightening up" of relations as Kiesinger now called it. In this situation Herr Blessing was indispensable. His "Eastern experience" from the nazi period was important just as much as his virtuosity in the use of currency and credit as an instrument of imperialist expansion. So his period in office was pro-

longed so that he could help to govern certain spheres of the world by means of money.

The Mark "Loosens Up" Conditions

The *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* was recently surprised: "Also in the assessment of the tendencies of the new German eastern policy which has become public in various ways the informed observer is surprised at the amount of goodwill which Bonn shows Czechoslovakia at the moment..." The *Handelsblatt* was clearer when it pointed out the dependence of the Bonn granting of credit on the "loosening up of the political and economic scene" in the socialist states.

The "loosening up", which West German financial magnates renumerate with favourable credit thus seems to be the cause for the "goodwill" of the armament billionaires and the status quo changers. Is that not something to think about?

Developments in Czechoslovakia since January caused the expectations of the West German imperialists to soar. The *Volkswirt* exultingly wrote in July that influential persons in Czechoslovakia were seeking financial support in the West. They could not bridge over the economic difficulties without credit.

So, Herr Blessing set out for Prague.

Credits for Counter-Revolution

Czechoslovak working people had nothing good to expect from an arch enemy of the working class and socialism like him. The *Handelsblatt* divulged that "the weather had not been the subject of discussion" in Prague. "The question of a standby credit in western currency, as a quite common form of cooperation between various banks of issue, was discussed with Blessing." Furthermore, the discussion included support of "Czech efforts to become a member of the Inter-

national Monetary Fund. Czechoslovakia would then be the first 'real' Eastern bloc country in the IMF... and that in turn could be an example for other countries in this sphere."

Indeed—wishful thinking on the part of the imperialists. A socialist state member of the IMF, the central institution of the fatally ill imperialist monetary system which stumbles from one crisis to another. One can picture for himself what kind of socialism would exist in such a "real Eastern bloc country". As to the granting of a standby credit, that is certainly a "common form" of "mutual help" of the imperialist states in economic and currency crisis. After all, the joint struggle against socialism, the concern for the maintenance of the rotten capitalist system forces them to stand together in a dummy way. But that such a dyed-in-the-wool anti-communist as Blessing offers a socialist state credit to strengthen it in agreement with Kiesinger and Strauss—that is nothing but political forgery! No one can believe that, or at the most readers of the mass-circulation *Bildzeitung* and the listeners of the American-sponsored RIAS broadcasting station in West Berlin.

There is but one conclusion: Herr Blessing and his chiefs expected real guarantees that such a credit would be beneficial to imperialism, would serve the strengthening of its positions.

Ripe for a Pension

The tactical line for the further advance was given a few days after Blessing's return in an editorial in the *Handelsblatt*. The newspaper warned against "having our economic strength be effective in foreign policy in loud tones; mostly more can be obtained with discreet, but all the more tenacious and determined advances".

On 21 August 1968 all further "discreet" attempts to persuade Czechoslovakia by means of credit to leave the socialist family of nations, and to return to the past

were thwarted. Along with the "new Eastern policy" the concept of expansion by means of credit and currency also ran aground. Herr Blessing can now retire on pension—he, too stands helplessly in front of his wrecked policy.

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin, 18 September 1960) Dr Wolfgang Kiessling

"Spring-Trip"

Seen in the Retrospective

During the events in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic the mass media there proved to be the Trojan horse of Bonn's modern crusaders not least of all because they imparted a picture of West German imperialism which—if at all—differed only in nuances from the image which the federal German government wishes to produce abroad. An integrated part of ideological diversion, which was to stir up counter-revolutionary developments in the heart of Europe was the effort to camouflage the policy of aggression and revenge pursued by Bonn, to glorify it and finally to deny its existence. The press, radio and television in Czechoslovakia were increasingly silent about the dangers to the whole of Europe and thereby their own country emanating from West German imperialism. Instead, as is known, ever more was said about strengthening relations between Prague and Bonn. This aimed at slowly but surely withdrawing Czechoslovakia from the socialist community. All these efforts were made under various camouflages. Thus, an "offensive of democratic socialism" or of "a big leap forward" were written and spoken about. An editorial in the German-language Prague *Volkszeitung* declared in June of this year: "We shall consolidate our relations with the West European governments and big parties. Not to subject ourselves to their conditions but to exert more influence on

them!" But who exerted an influence on whom was quite a different story.

Let us remain, in order to make that clear, with the cited Prague *Volkszeitung*. Let us cast a glance at the role played in the past few months by its former editor-in-chief, Vojmir Simonek. As we have already informed our readers Simonek is said to have gone to West Germany to work in future for the Hamburg *Stern*, the Zeitungs- und the Wegner Publishing House. Seen in the light of this "career" Simonek's past activity takes on a special colouring.

Let us be a bit concrete. Let us have a close look for example, at a "spring trip" which took editor-in-chief Simonek into Bonn's realm. What he saw and how he saw it he described in a reportage in several sequences which was printed in June and July of this year in the weekly paper edited by him.

Poisonous Weeds

Let us follow Simonek on some of the stations of his "spring trip". It was intention, so he wrote, to see with his own eyes, the "poisonous weeds in a flourishing country", as he chose to paraphrase neo-nazism and revanchism. His political conception is revealed already in this botanical picture. Neo-nazism and revanchism are for him not an integral part of the political system of the Federal Republic but marginal phenomena which exist independently of the Bonn government mechanism.

Simonek's trip began for him under the most favourable conditions. For his departure beyond the frontiers a window-washing team cleaned "the window panes from the outside—so that we can see the difference between here and there". He had no fixed program in Nuremberg. On seeing the neon-lit streets and shop windows he felt called upon to reflect "upon the real purpose" of his trip and to ask himself "why the weeds of neo-nazism are beginning to sprout here

again". And he thought—as the Marxist-Leninist knowledge of the nature of imperialism is not advantageous for unlimited freedom of the press—thus, in his sense, "because the high standard of living, full stomachs and first-class clothing dull the thinking of people". But quite certainly he did not think that of himself. And so he decided to ask specialists.

Observed "without Prejudice"

In Munich he visited the building of the Bavarian radio where he was directed—after all, he came from a socialist country—to the specialist on "eastern policy". Simonek frankly confesses to his readers that this Herr M. would years ago have been called "professional agitator". Now he was to be observed "without prejudice". And mind you, the "eastern expert" proved to be very agile intellectually. According to Simonek's theory of fascism, therefore, he was immune to the "bacillus of nazism".

"I read all obtainable material in order to be as well informed as possible about the socialist states", said Herr M. In truth nobody would have expected otherwise from such a "specialist". "We know", continued the "eastern expert", "that something very important is at stake in Prague . . ." What, I wonder? No doubt the guest from Prague could have given the answer. But he remained silent. Instead he was passed over to a meeting of the entire editorial team of the Bavarian radio where he asked the gentlemen about the "future of anti-communism". The answer which was spread without comment in Czechoslovakia was unambiguous: "That rests in your hands. A free life in a socialist state takes the wind out of the sails of this ideological doctrine." Counter-revolutionary logic is so simple: Dismantle socialism and we shall stop the battle against you.

In 1967 Simonek took part as an observer in the "Sudeten German Congress". At that time he was able

to report that the onetime Sudeten Germans did not want to return. Now, on his "spring trip" his "attention" was drawn to something new." An old acquaintance helped him in this, "a former editor of the *Brünn Morgenpost* who was put on trial after the war in Brno, although he would "sooner have helped than harmed" the Czechs. This Erwin, who in Munich "wore the uniform of the protection force of a big firm" was recently in Brno on a visit. At the town hall he had asked if he could return as a pensioner. Naturally, he would have his pension in West marks transmitted.

And how did Simonek react to this frankness? We can only repeat what he told his readers: "But Erwin . . . Munich is also a beautiful city." The friend's answer tolerated no objection: "I am a German, but my home town remains Brünn. Especially now it attracts me . . . I'm going back and that's all there is to it!"

Harmless Cacti

When editor-in-chief Simonek—about his choice of partners for discussion one need no longer wonder—inquired from an official of the *Landsmannschaft* (revanchist association of fellow-countrymen—ed.) if that were an individual case, he was answered: "Before I retire I would move to Bohemia." And a student added: "Even young people who were born here would accept a position in Czechoslovakia." In order to have a better effect on the readers Simonek still played naive: "Aren't you doing well here?" he asked. The answer, which could have been taken from an old colonial book, speaks for itself: "Maybe we are like a cactus—if one puts it in lush black earth it withers. Its element is sand."

Vojmir Simonek had gone on a trip to look for "poisonous weeds". But hitherto he had found only harmless "cacti" which were speculating on new soil.

Now he turned his steps towards Baden-Württemberg where he asked a single question to the editorial

"How could it happen that the neo-nazi NPD received ten per cent of the votes in your province?" There were several replies. And he took them all down for inclusion in his reportage. What is ten per cent, ninety per cent had not voted for the NPD. One should put the neo-nazis at the head of the ministries, then it would be shown "that they are unfit". "Without prejudice", as he was, Simonek could not recall that the old nazis were launched into leading positions with similar arguments, and that for twelve long years they had abundant opportunity to demonstrate their "unfitness", not least to the injury of Czechoslovakia.

No Chance?

After the motto "paper does not blush" the traveller from Prague noted everything of Bonn propaganda sayings he was offered: A nationalistic party would have no chance in West Germany for "young people travel much more throughout the world than earlier generations. Not only to Italy and France, but also to Czechoslovakia . . . Today the German general thinks in European terms, he constantly has to do with the staffs of other countries, learns foreign languages . . ." Enough of the samples of intellectual "food" which were tied together in the columns of the Prague *Volkszeitung*.

This uncritical acceptance and dissemination of anti-socialist tirades discloses the "documentary" method which Simonek announced as a desirable from of "coming to grips" with neo-nazism and revanchism in an interview for West German television before his "spring trip".

However, Simonek's method deserves special attention under the following aspect: The political message of his reportage, which is devoid of all socialist values and written from a bourgeois point of view, was imbedded in the simple description of personal impres-

sions and experiences. It is imparted to the reader in a dose which at the beginning is light and which gradually becomes stronger. The reportage corresponds to the requirements which Franz Josef Strauss set forth for effective ideological subversion: "Our ideas are to be slipped into the public life of the communist states with every means of propaganda in a psychologically clever way . . . People in the communist states thus become conscious or unconscious bearers of western ideas."

Underhanded Curiosity

During his 14-day trip through West Germany Simonek was strengthened in his intentions "in talks with 96 journalists and politicians". And he had the certainty that "the young CDU deputy, Herr Dr Juhnke, too, wished our socialism success. Especially out of curiosity, because that is something new and man should move with progress."

Back in Prague, Simonek stormed against the countries of the socialist community in an editorial, especially against the G.D.R., which characterized as creeping counter-revolution what he and his peers were presenting as progress and socialism. "We do not think", he declared, "that our neighbour should give advice across the fence, as to how the other is to cultivate his garden. Everyone should best know that for himself."

That was said by the same editor-in-chief who allowed the Bonn neighbour to give him advice by the sackful. And he was, as the words of his editorial prove, already a victim of this advice. Would he otherwise have been capable of comparing the relations between socialist states which are borne by the spirit of proletarian internationalism with the relations between small gardeners? His "botanically" trimmed thinking which was to be made clear here only on the strength of a reportage written by him, proves to be but a barely veiled

camouflage of his anti-socialist inclinations and actions.

And Simonek's "spring trip" is but one example of the varied ways and paths by which the counter-revolution was able to slip its ideas into the C.S.S.R. and disseminate them.

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin, September 26, 1968)

Program out of the Background

On the Attitude of Professor Goldstücker

by Dr Anneliese Grosse
and Dr Reinhard Weisbach

Professor Eduard Goldstücker, until recently professor of German literary history and pro-rector of the Charles University in Prague, has now gone to London. In the past few months he developed a wide range of activities, both journalistically and organizationally, activities which were one of the prerequisites for a gradual softening up of socialism and the conscious and coldly calculated counter-revolution in Czechoslovakia.

He says of himself that he has been a communist for 35 years. He worked for the Czechoslovak exile government in London as a scientific assistant after he had gone into exile from Hitler's "protectorate" and from 1948 to 1951 he became a diplomat for the socialist Czechoslovak Republic. In 1952 he was sentenced to several years in jail. In 1956, after serving the sentence, he began lecturing at the university. He made a name for himself at the beginning of the sixties with a comprehensive Czech edition of the works of Goethe.

These few facts suffice to show who the apostles of the global strategy hoped to find when they took an interest in Goldstücker: a man of "international reputation", of "philosophical exactitude", a credible "old communist" and likewise a "victim of the personality cult". What they wanted above all, was to find a personality who was suited and prepared to act as the

intellectual leader of the "liberalization", the silent defamation and destruction of socialism from within—in other words, a man prepared to serve counter-revolution.

Tactics at the Kafka Conference

Goldstücker began to show his talents for this task at the Kafka conference in Liblice in May 1963. His behaviour and method of argument at the time obviously became the model for his future tactics which seemed useful and clever to him to hold on to. At the conference he took the rostrum three times: once to express his friendly greetings, once for a sober, scientific lecture which contained just a few, but very well-directed pointers and then to sum up. This last speech was anything but limited to scientific argumentation and went on the offensive in political questions.

At the time, it seemed advisable to Goldstücker to introduce politics into the Kafka conference with an anti-socialist conception on two points:

- The phenomena of alienation also exists under socialist conditions, in fact it is even possible "that in some stages, the people feel a much stronger alienation than under capitalism".

- Kafka should definitely be recommended to young people, for his aesthetic effect was not destructive, particularly under socialist conditions, but educates one to struggle against making a fetish of one's surroundings.

Goldstücker and other Czechoslovak representatives completely overlooked at this conference that their arguments were nothing but the uncritical acceptance of stereotyped thinking which, 15 years previously, had been created by the imperialist ideology of the cold war in the struggle against the U.S.S.R. and the developing world socialist system. In a real flood of political and ideological publications the course of the

people's democratic revolutions and the developing world socialist system was attacked—most aggressively were James and Burnham—under the slogans of "democracy", "freedom", "stereotyping", "iron curtain", etc.

What Goldstücker and his kind believed (or at least appeared to believe) was that these theories were the result solely of the central continental position of Prague.

Apart from such nationalistic sources, which greatly helped to create the revisionist and counter-revolutionary ideas in Czechoslovakia, the use of Marxist terminology—even if inexact—played a big role. A third element which belongs to the revisionist method of argumentation and which was first used at the Kafka conference, particularly by Goldstücker, was that of intellectual moralizing, an ethical lacquer with which each theory was painted and made as attractive as possible.

Nationalism and the "Third Model"

Goldstücker's nationalism showed itself in certain milieu theories, mostly oriented on Prague, which exaggerate the beauties and advantages of the Czechoslovak landscape.

And this attitude in turn became possible only after it had been declared that Prague was to act as a bridge between East and West and should become an intellectual centre of a "Marxist renaissance". In fact, it must become the "capital" of Marxism in Central Europe. These pretty words were intended to open the gate wide for ideological coexistence.

Even if the ideologists in Czechoslovakia, including Goldstücker, opposed naked revenge-seeking in the form of the Landsmannschaften and their demands, they opened the Czechoslovak capital for the official West German government ideology which took care not to offend Goldstücker & Co., and for the time

being avoided the question of the Munich Agreement. Everything was directed at the coexistence of a softened-up "reformed" socialism without the dictatorship of the proletariat, without the leading role of the party of the working class, with a "peacefully" dressed-up and "contact interested" West German imperialism.

Under such conditions, it only needed a pointed finger, once against the Soviet Union another time against the G.D.R. to give rise to a wave of nationalism. And so that the young intellectuals should not feel the narrowness of such a position, it was Svitak who gave them certain cosmopolitan perspectives: "You live in Europe: You do not live in America, but you also do not live in the Soviet Union."

It is obvious that such developments delighted the various specialists of the American global strategy, be it the occidental Europe ideology (of course without the U.S.S.R.), as the Strauss concept of "Europe up to the Urals (of course with a special status for Prague) or quite generally as "building a bridge between the eastern and western hemispheres" (what the "new eastern policy" of the Kiesinger–Strauss–Brandt government mostly corresponds to).

Within this process Goldstücker could confine himself to giving specific impulses. And the direction was the "third way": "Why should the third model not be possible? Why should something be inconceivable only because it was not thought of previously?" (Goldstücker in *Die Zeit*, 3 May 1968)

Pseudo-Marxism

Goldstücker never tired of calling himself a Marxist or communist in his appearances. Adroit in form even though at the beginning (1963–64) still somewhat unfamiliar with the matter he took over certain results of bourgeois and revisionist discussions on Marx and operated primarily with the term "alienation"!

However, Goldstücker applied this term, which was to be recognized whether it would be one of those elements always understood by Marx as the designation for the elements which make this earth habitable for man in a socio-political and moral consequences from the quite new way; the social revolution was without perspective and must be understood as a sum of evolutions in a sense which no longer had anything to do with conditions which would have to be made positivistically from the concrete social and economic relations of man, the standpoint of a reformer—that is, as the case may be but was attributed to man in any case, independently of the revolution had no other aim to achieve than the social conditions under which he exists.

In detail he argues as follows:

- Man is exposed to the tragedy of having to face a state, in the final analysis, had the same task (and nature alone—quite in contrast to other living beings) as the bourgeois state and (at the best) had available the same possibilities of solution.
- The more unnatural the life of man becomes with the development of technical civilization the more important for him is the maintenance of the illusion of still being a child of nature. This illusion is created for him by art and literature, and that is the original function of beauty.
- The more technical civilization isolates the individual the more does he need the assurance of being able to take part in the destiny of others. The only means of his integration in the community of the entire human race is, again, art.

If the theoretical level of such a message is already highly poverty-stricken, the abrupt eclecticism of it stands out as does the relapse into the most insipid idealism. It is not the liberation struggle of the working class led by its party, and the systematic and consciously shaped construction of socialism which overcomes exploitation, alienation and the crippling effects of the division of labour—as theoretically explained and proved in practice by Marxism-Leninism—rather, according to Goldstücker, isolation, humiliation and inhumanity cannot be abolished. Art and literature accordingly are also not effective accompaniments of the human liberation struggle but have the sole task of spreading a “beautiful lustre” over the continuing misery.

Also the scientific-technological revolution was to be observed with great distrust, he says and it was not a third source of revisionist and counter-revolutionary thinking is abstract moralizing. Anxiety and con- isolation, the integrity and authority of the individual, fear and love in a strongly generalized form played a big role and were summarized as the demand for freedom in diverse variations. The starting point was incessant discussion of the “liberty” of artistic creation. The accent here was always so fixed that liberty was demanded for creating room for the bourgeois aesthetic platform. That is, liberty, for the relapse into bourgeois artistic activity, but not liberty to discover what is new in socialism and to help it to a breakthrough. Thus, liberty for bourgeois comforts, for imports from the West, for the return to the decadent salon activity. But no liberty for socialist virgin terri-

tory, for ventures of a socialist kind, for the heroism and risk in labour and the mode of life of the masses.

Thus, in such a way did the sudden, direct, naked and immediate counter-revolution appear in the intellectual sphere in Czechoslovakia, camouflaged and passed on, translated into the mediate and indirect theses of the cold war propaganda were clothed in nationalistic, pseudo-Marxist and abstract moralizing garb.

Whereas Goldstücker primarily appeared as a theoretician up to January of this year, after the January plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia the time appeared to him to be suitable for coming out of the background and publicly intervening in political life in Czechoslovakia and also working actively on making contacts with western publication and propaganda establishments.

And so he used, for example, the microphone of the Bavarian radio to disseminate counter-revolutionary ideas: "We are at the beginning of a great, not short, process and we do not want every thing to be crystallized immediately. We want this process to go to the limits of its possibilities, we want to keep the end open as long as possible. We do not want to fix already today the limits to which this process can go."

As Goldstücker hid behind the old revisionist thesis "The movement is everything, the goal nothing" he encouraged his followers to undertake the immediate dismantling of socialist achievements in the C.S.S.R.

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin, 27 September 1968)

True and False Unity

by Dr Hajo Herbell

Unity "as never before" we read, rules in Czechoslovakia. West German newspapers portray this unity with a sympathy which they otherwise bestow only on the machinations of the splitters in the socialist movement.

Before we give our opinion on the nature and extent of the oft-cited unity in Czechoslovakia, allow us one remark. "Unity" is a term which has many colours and is very broad in its scope. At first we see that there is no unity "in itself". One must know what is meant. In our Republic everyone who takes part in the party school knows the philosophical term of unity of the world in its materiality. He learns that dialectical contradiction is the unity and struggle of opposites. Then there is the term "unity" in politics. Old and young in this country here sing the stirring song of the united workers' front. Our party is called Socialist Unity Party. It bears this name with pride for its foundation put an end to the decades-long split in the working-class. We are consolidating the political and moral unity of our people in the construction of socialism. We are struggling for the unity of the international communist and workers' movement. All this is unity in a good sense, true unity.

On What Basis?

But even these few examples present to our eyes the unity of the fatherland" in the spirit of Kaiser Wilhelm: For me there are no longer any parties, but only of political unity apart from the struggle of the classes, Germans. That of course was obvious cynical hypocrisy. Liebkecht was excluded from that new, false between socialism and imperialism. No one can escape, in fact, disastrous unity. Everyone who clinged to cape the question of unity with whom and against the old, true, anti-imperialist unity of the workers was whom. It would be self-deception if one were to think excluded—they were defamed as "unpatriotic elements" that there is a unity which is independent of the interments".

est of classes. "In every really serious and deep-going Let us briefly recall that the German working-class political question", wrote Lenin, "grouping is on the movement at that time—before 1914—had not yet come basis of class and not on the basis of nation." Further to realize the experience of their Russian class brothers. Every unity has its political and ideological foundations. Before one unites and in order to unite, according tions. It arises out of a definite consciousness. There is to Lenin, one must first resolutely and definitely differentiate between each other. In other words, only on nevertheless no uniform, homogeneous consciousness for all classes, for capitalism and socialism. Thus, we the basis of firm revolutionary principles can unity be are again at the starting point—there is no political effective as a world-changing force. Without principles unity in itself. The question is: unity—on what basis? It is a sand drift; the next wind, the next wave will

As to the German working class it has a lot of experience on just this question. Let us take the old

Social Democratic Party. It was a powerful force, because it was united, united on the basis of the theories of Marx and Engels. But nevertheless, with imperialism came opportunism. It deeply struck roots in the party. It was recognized, and also appraised and condemned. But in the interest "of the unity of the party" there was no breach with Bernstein, Vollmar, Schippel, and the like. Thus the true and powerful unity could slide off into a false and impotent unity. The lesson for the international workers movement was that true unity can only be defended and consolidated when at the same time the purity of Marxist ideology is defended and consolidated in the face of opportunist phraseology.

A Word by Lenin

The outcome of these developments was August 4, 1914, instead of socialist internationalism there was

social patriotism. Instead of the united front of the workers against imperialism and war there was the

unity of the fatherland" in the spirit of Kaiser Wilhelm: For me there are no longer any parties, but only of political unity apart from the struggle of the classes, Germans. That of course was obvious cynical hypocrisy. Liebkecht was excluded from that new, false between socialism and imperialism. No one can escape, in fact, disastrous unity. Everyone who clinged to cape the question of unity with whom and against the old, true, anti-imperialist unity of the workers was whom. It would be self-deception if one were to think excluded—they were defamed as "unpatriotic elements" that there is a unity which is independent of the interments".

est of classes. "In every really serious and deep-going Let us briefly recall that the German working-class political question", wrote Lenin, "grouping is on the movement at that time—before 1914—had not yet come basis of class and not on the basis of nation." Further to realize the experience of their Russian class brothers. Every unity has its political and ideological foundations. Before one unites and in order to unite, according tions. It arises out of a definite consciousness. There is to Lenin, one must first resolutely and definitely differentiate between each other. In other words, only on nevertheless no uniform, homogeneous consciousness for all classes, for capitalism and socialism. Thus, we the basis of firm revolutionary principles can unity be are again at the starting point—there is no political effective as a world-changing force. Without principles unity in itself. The question is: unity—on what basis? It is a sand drift; the next wind, the next wave will wash it away.

Sheep and Shearer

There is not space enough to pursue this historical thread right into present-day conditions in West-Germany. One thing should be mentioned, however. After the double catastrophe of false unity it is once again being patched together there by imperialists and right-wing social democratic leaders. This time not a "people's community", but as "social partnership". It is the unity of subjection to the monopolies, to unbridled nationalism and revanchism. It is the unity of the false or lacking consciousness generated by the giant opinion factories. A poll taken by the Institute of Demoscopy in Allensbach in June this year revealed that about 80 per cent of the citizens of the Federal Republic do not want "to have anything to do with politics". The great French novelist Romain Rolland castigated phenomena of this kind after the

world-shaking events of 1917 with the following bitter words: "The millions of people in sheepskins, honest people, intoxicated by a press of friends of the people, anxiously gathered around their woolshearers in a front against those who wanted to liberate them." Those who wanted and want to liberate them—they are today in West Germany those who are again shut out of the unity so useful to imperialism—the communists, left-wing students, the extra-parliamentary opposition,

prevent the coming into existence of a false unity on a nationalist basis. But this necessary development did not occur. The anti-socialist forces increasingly got the upper hand. They published their political-ideological platform, the so-called 2,000 Words. They disintegrated the party and the state. In home and foreign policy they pressed for a course which was to break Czechoslovakia out of the socialist community, which represents our unity.

What Happened in Czechoslovakia?

Of course, the situation in Czechoslovakia is not completely comparable with all that. Other problems are at stake. In our neighbouring country a situation had arisen in which it was a question of solving complicated tasks in the development of socialist society and in which at the same time omissions had to be made good. Mistakes had to be overcome. We never left any doubt that we considered that to be necessary. However, in the so-called process of renewal anti-socialist forces soon appeared openly. With the massive support of the imperialist centres—especially the proponents of the "new eastern policy" in Bonn—the counter-revolutionary forces began to align. The Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the CPCZ held in May this year found itself obliged to speak of "increased anti-communist tendencies", of "attacks on what the working class and the entire people had created in the past years", of open attempts "to introduce into our society the danger of division and conflict".

What would have been necessary? A determined offensive, united will and action against the anti-socialist forces. To say it again in the words of Lenin: It would have been necessary resolutely and definitively to draw the dividing lines, to separate oneself in order to defend true unity against the enemies of the cause of the working class or to restore this unity in order to

Again Expelled

We do not need to go into details here, they are generally known and were especially momentous: counter-revolutionary forces laid hold of the press, radio and television. The new, false unity was manipulated chiefly with these powerful means of forming public opinion—a unity in the evil spirit of nationalism, only interlarded with socialist phrases to conceal the reactionary essence of this unity and to deceive the masses. "Never was there so much unity", we heard. But we see that those are again expelled who worked for true unity in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, internationalism and friendship with the Soviet Union. On the walls of Prague appeared lists with the names of staunch communists, with a death's skull above them. Illegal broadcasting stations fulminated against the "traitors to the people". What kind of unity, then? On what foundations? Unity with whom? Always a burning question in the class struggle: for whose benefit?

The facts answer for themselves. To be sure they also answer the other question which we asked at the beginning, the one about the real extent of the unity referred to. Those 99 Prague automobile workers, who despite unimaginable moral intimidation had the courage to declare their sympathy with socialism and the Soviet Union openly—they and all like-minded persons in fact form no unity with those who are literally coming down upon them. The anti-socialist

journalists of various newspapers and radio stations—they obviously form no unity with those comrades who repeatedly criticized the activity of these journalists. Those working people in Northern Bohemia who on the occasion of the 19th anniversary of the G.D.R. demonstrated their firm friendship with the German peace state in our Prague embassy—they form no unity with the wire-pullers of the counter-revolution who want to promote their false unity within the country by smearing on the wall the picture of an external threat. However, they do not feel the policy of Kiesinger and Strauss to be the alleged threat but, of all things, the socialist brother countries, among them the G.D.R.

It will require a great amount of arduous ideological work to re-establish and expand the true political and moral unity in Czechoslovakia on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. For us and for our comrades in Czechoslovakia we draw as a conclusion from the past and present that where false unity is at its peak the working masses are the farthest away from their real interests.

Our own and international experience teaches:

- Unity with the counter-revolution logically leads to division and catastrophe. Socialism is incompatible with the conceptions and practices of people like Ivan Svitak, who is now officially in the service of the wire-pullers of the creeping counter-revolution in Czechoslovakia. In the interest of socialism one must break with these people and in a principled way and in good time!
- There is never unity "in itself", or in any place, it is always determined by its class content. We say "yes" to the unity of the working class with the farmers and other working strata against anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary forces, because such unity serves the interests of socialism and the entire nation. But we say 'no' to "national unity" against the interests of the working class and its allies.
- Finally: Just as on a national level, the class ques-

tion is also posed on an international level. Unity of the international working class, the consolidation of the unity and cohesion of the world communist movement on the basis of proletarian internationalism promote the union of all revolutionary forces and serve the national interests. Nationalism and national particularities regarded as the supreme principle inevitably lead to division and play into the hands of the class enemy.

In any case we shall—concerning the judgment of false unity—always keep faithful to Karl Liebknecht who, fifty years ago in November 1918 wrote in the *Rote Fahne*: "The 'holy unity' delivered the masses of the people unconditionally into the clutches of the war-mongers... Anyone who warningly and accusingly raised his voice against the misleaders of the proletariat was decried and persecuted as obstructionist, disturber of the peace, traitor to the country and the war... Unity in the spirit, in the thinking, in will and actions, only that is true unity. Unity in phrase is a will-o'-the-wisp, self-deception or fraud."

(From *Neues Deutschland*, Berlin, October 15, 1968)